

11- Vb
A
D E F E N C E
O F T H E
Hebrew B I B L E,
I N
A N S W E R

MISTAKE
TO THE
Charge of C O R R U P T I O N

Brought against it by

Mr. *W H I S T O N*,

I N H I S

*Essay towards restoring the true Text
of the Old Testament, &c.*

W H E R E I N

Mr. *W H I S T O N*'s Pretences are particularly
Examined and Confuted,

By the Reverend Dr. *C A R P Z O V*. of *Leipsick*. (J. G.)

Translated from the *Latin*, with additional Notes,

By *M O S E S M A R C U S*,

A Converted *Jew*, and Teacher of the *Oriental*
Languages.

L O N D O N :

Printed for *BERNARD LINTOT* at the *Cross-Keys* be-
tween the *Temple-Gates* in *Fleet-street*. M D C C X X I X.



902

THE TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

ABOUT seven Years ago, Mr. *Whiston* published his *Essay towards restoring the true Text of the Old Testament*: So he intitles the Piece, instead of calling it, as he more justly might, *An Essay towards confounding and destroying the true Hebrew Bible*. This Work of his has hitherto pass'd amongst us, without any serious Answer to it, and has done much Mischief; having afforded Matter of Triumph to the Unbelievers, and given great Occasion to the Enemies of the Lord to blaspheme. I presume not to guess the Reasons why so pernicious a Book has escaped so long without an Answer from our very learned and able Divines: Whether the Wildness of Mr. *Whiston's* Attempt was thought to carry its own Confutation with it; or whether the Drudgery of examining and discussing so much tedious Impertinence, deterr'd them from engaging in it. But I humbly conceive, that the Importance of the Point in Que-

tion would have been sufficient to justify the undertaking it, tho' against the weakest Adversary; and it can never be improper, or without its use, to defend *the Bible* against all Assailants. Some regard also should be had for the unlearned and unstable, who may be liable to be impos'd upon by meer Appearances, when advanced with an Air of Confidence, and a Shew of Significancy: So that upon their Account, an Answer might have been proper, and would have been of Service; if not so much to the top Scholars, yet to the half-learned, or ignorant Readers, which make perhaps nine Parts in ten, or a much greater Proportion.

Upon these, or the like Considerations, a very learned Foreigner, finding us tardy, has been pleas'd to take this kind Office upon him, for which we are much obliged to him. And as his Answer to Mr. *Whiston* appears to be very full, judicious, and satisfactory, I have been perswaded to translate it; that thus at length an *English* Writing, doing most mischief among *English* Readers, might have an *English* Reply: And if I have but tolerably done my Part as a Translator, I doubt not but the following Papers will be esteemed as a compleat Answer to Mr. *Whiston's Essay*, and that it could have none better, and will need no other.

The very Reverend and Worthy Author, I have had the Honour to see, more than
once

P R E F A C E.

once, at *Leipsick*, being Professor of Divinity in that famous University, and *Archdeacon* of the Church: And I have often heard him spoken of in *Germany*, in Terms of very great Respect, as of *Another Buxtorf*. But Dr. *Carpzov* is best known to the learned World by his excellent Writings, by two of them more particularly, which may be called his *great Works*, to say nothing now of his smaller Pieces.

His first great Work is his *Introduction to the canonical Books of the Old Testament*, published intire at *Leipsick*, A. D. 1721. This Book is in *Quarto*, and was publish'd at first by *Parcels*, in the Years 1714, 1720, 1721.

The first Part reaches no farther than the *historical Books of the Canon*, and contains Pages 366. The second relates to the *poetical Books*, containing Pages 278. The third takes in all the *prophetical*, and shuts up the whole, containing Pages 487. Our learned Author, in the Work which I here publish in *English*, frequently refers to his *Introduction*: And therefore it may not be improper to give the *English Reader* some Idea of the Book so often referr'd to. It is a Work of great Labour and uncommon Erudition,

• Introductio ad Libros Canonicos Bibliorum veteris Testamenti omnes, præcognita Critica & Historica ac Autoritatis vindicias Exponens. Adornata studio L. Joh. Gottlob Carpzovii. Prof. publ. & Archidiaconi *Thomani Lipsiæ*. A. D. 1721.

vi *The* TRANSLATOR'S

comprizing in a narrow Compass, and in a clear Method, the most useful Parts of *Biblical Learning*. His Method therein is, upon every canonical Book of Scripture, taken separately, to consider first its *Title*; next, its *Place in the Canon*; then its *Author*; after that, its *Subject, Design, and Use*. From thence he proceeds to defend its *Authenticity* against ancient or modern Opposers, and to settle its *Chronology* with particular Care and Exactness. After this, He represents the *Partition* of the Book, and gives the *Contents* of the Chapters. Last of all, he enumerates the principal *Commentators* upon every Book severally; first, *Fathers, Greek and Latin*, next *Rabbins*, then *Lutherans, Papists, Reformed, and Remonstrants* in order. This may suffice for a general Sketch or View of that elaborate and very useful Performance.

His second *great Work* is his ^b *sacred Criticks*, a *Latin Quarto*, containing Pages 979. A Book well answering its Title, penned with a great deal of Care and Thought, with Judgment and Accuracy, and full of true and solid Learning. It consists of three Parts, as follows.

I. The first Part, as far as to Page 428, treats of the *Hebrew Text* of the Old Testament; of its divine Original, its Authority, Purity, and Integrity; Of the Partition of

^b Critica Sacra Veteris Testamenti. Lipsiæ 1728.

I. Circa Textum Originalem.

the *Hebrew Bible*, of the original Language, of the *Masora*, of the various Lections, of the *Hebrew Manuscripts*, and of the printed Editions.

2. The second Part, from Page 428 to Page 780, treats of the *Versions of the Hebrew Bible*; *Chaldee*, *Greek*, *Samaritan* with *Samaritan Pentateuch*, *Syriack*, *Arabick*, *Ethiopic*, *Latin* ancient and modern, and *German*.

3. The third Part, from Page 781 to Page 979, is a *Defence of the Hebrew Bible*, in *Answer to the Charge of Corruption brought against it by Mr. Whiston, in his Essay, &c.* It is this last Part only, that I here offer to the World in an *English Dress*, for the Benefit of *English Readers* especially, and such others as cannot perhaps easily, or without paying treble the Price, come at the Original. The *Latin Answer*, being part only of the large Work, cannot be had separate from the other Parts. Indeed our Author did publish an Answer to Mr. *Whiston* by itself, in the Year 1724: But that Piece contain'd only the four first Chapters of what he has since publish'd, together with his *Critica Sacra*, in the Year 1728. So that the six last Chapters of what I here translate, are all new, never before publish'd that I know of.

2. Circa Versiones.

3. Circa Pseudo-Criticam Gul. Whistonii.

Mr. *Whiston*, to my certain Knowledge, had both seen and perused so much as was publish'd in 1724. Which tho' not so compleat as what has been done since, yet might have been sufficient to have abated his Confidence a little, so long at least as till he should have drawn up some Reply to it; which he has never done, that I can learn. But, as if no such Piece had been ever written, and as if his *Essay* had pass'd Current every where, and every Dream of his were Demonstration, he has been pleased to boast highly of his Performance, looking upon that *Essay* as his *Opus Palmarium*, his Master-piece, and referring to it perpetually, in almost every thing he has publish'd since, as to a Work of indisputed Credit, and unquestionable Verity. How far it is from it, the impartial and discerning Reader will soon judge, upon perusing the following Papers in answer to him. One shall there see, with Pleasure, the vast Difference there is between a Man that can only state or repeat Difficulties, and one that can solidly answer and reconcile them. The Reader will here find several curious and useful Parts of Learning handsomely clear'd up, many of the most doubtful Texts admirably well explain'd, and the most knotty Objections, not disguised or slightly pass'd over, but thoroughly discuss'd and removed. If it might be thought of less Moment, to have answer'd Mr. *Whiston*; or if his

P R E F A C E. ix

his Authority, especially in this Kind of Literature, might bear the less Weight; yet it is a Satisfaction here to have in a little Compass, a sufficient Answer not only to him, but to other very considerable Men, *Morinus, Cappellus, Vossius, Simon, Pezron,* and *Le Clerc*; from whom Mr. *Whiston*, in a Manner has barely copied. Possibly, he may have acted the frugal Part, unwilling to spend out of his own Stock till there should be an absolute Necessity for it. If that be the Case, the *Necessity* is now come; for our learned Author having both discover'd and taken from him all his *borrow'd* Materials, he will now be necessitated either to desist, or to produce something of his *own*.

If any Man be curious enough to ask, why I, in particular, have engaged in this Affair, and taken this Part upon Me; it might be sufficient to say, because no body else had done it, and I knew not whether any would. But I must further own, that I had a particular Ambition to vindicate the *Jews*, my own Brethren and Countreymen, from so heavy and heinous a Charge, as that of maliciously and sacrilegiously corrupting and depraving the *sacred Text*. A hideous Crime, such, as I am confident, they could never have thought of without Horror and Detestation, having been ever most religiously scrupulous in regard to the *sacred Text*, and not at all less conscientious,

in

in that respect, than even the most pious *Christians*. Their Infidelity, and Opposition to *Christ Jesus* my Saviour, (owing to the unconquerable Prejudices of Education) I heartily condemn: And I thank my God, every Day of my Life, for giving me a Sight and Sense of my Errors, and bringing me within the Pale of the *Christian Church*. But still I retain, and ever shall retain that Regard for my Brethren, whom I have left for the Sake of *Christ*, as to do them all reasonable Justice, and to defend their Reputation against downright Calumny. Such was the Part that *Johan. Isaac*. a converted *Jew*, long ago * acted against the Papist *Lindanus*, who had slanderously charged the *Jews* with corrupting the *Hebrew Scriptures*, just as Mr. *Whiston* has done. As he defended his Countreymen, and the Word of God at the same Time, so do I in like Circumstances; but in such a way as I can, not as an Author, but as an humble Translator of another Man's Work, so much better than any thing of my own, as being of a very able and a first-Rate Writer.

As to the Translation itself, I have therein faithfully endeavoured, truly to represent the Sense of my Author: And if I have any where miss'd of it, I intreat the Author and the Publick, to pardon the involuntary Slips of a well-designing Hand. I have sometimes

* A. D. 1559.

P R E F A C E. xi

taken the Liberty of setting down Mr. *Whiston's* Objections in his own Words, and more largely than my Author had done, who had thought it sufficient (writing in a learned Language) merely to abridge the Sense. This I do as often as I apprehend it necessary or convenient for the *English* Reader, and to make the Point in debate better understood.

I have also thrown in a few occasional Notes, such as occur'd in the Course of the Work: And they are either short Hints for clearing up an obscure Part, or some farther Reinforcement to an Argument, or some additional References to Writers on the same Subject. I have taken the Pains to consult the Texts, all the way, which my Author refers to: And sometimes, where I have thought the Numbers wrong, by some Error of the Press, I have not scrupled to correct them, referring to such Place as I conceived my Author intended, and had wrote down in his own Copy.

I have further given most of the *Hebrew* Words, which occur single, and where it appear'd necessary, in *English* Letters; which our Author, writing to Scholars only, had no need to do. Upon the whole, I have endeavour'd to do Justice to my Author, and at the same Time to serve the Ease and Conveniency of the *English* Reader, as far as the Nature of the Work would allow.

And now I wish the Reader all the Pleasure

sure and Benefit in perusing this Treatise, which I have found in translating it. The Author is undoubtedly a great Master of the *Oriental* Learning, and has spent his Life in those Studies. But what most of all recommends, and must indear him to every pious and good Man, is his great Modesty and Sedateness, and his religious Veneration for the sacred Scriptures. He is most averse to that Spirit of Levity, that Wantonness of Criticizing, which pushes Men on to play with holy Things, to tamper needlessly with Texts, whose Readings are already fix'd, and to be hammering out endless Emendations. Our Author always takes the prudent, cautious, pious Part; which is also the most generous, as being most difficult, and fittest for so learned and able a Man. It is a very easy Matter to fall to hacking and hewing, upon every slight Occasion; and to cut the Knot which one cannot readily untie. Laziness, Ignorance, and Temerity, often prompt Men to it: And yet they pride themselves in it, as if they had done something considerable, in making what they would call a happy Emendation. We thank them for their kind Assistance; but let it be when we want it: Otherwise it is but troublesome and impertinent Officiousness. If the Objection can be taken off, and the Difficulty solved, without altering the Text, it is much better: And he is the truly great and learned Man that can do it.

It

It requires a deeper Penetration, and larger Compass of Thought, as well as of Learning. And if some Difficulties in Scripture appear, for the present, unsurmountable, it may be prudent to wait, till some Genius arise that may be equal to them, rather than hastily to have recourse to the last Remedies. How many Things of that Kind have been handsomely clear'd up and set to rights, even no longer ago than *L. Cappellus*; who was for mending, or rather mangling many Scripture Texts, as necessarily requiring it; tho' farther searches have shewn that the Text was right, and that nothing so much wanted Correction as the Corrector's own Fancy. It is but a while ago that *Le Clerc* in his *Prolegomena*, and *Comments*, was charging an Interpolation upon the xxxvith Chapter of *Genesis*, and giving broad Hints, that he could wish to have nine whole Verses, about the *Horites*, expunged. But the learned Bishop *Cumberland*, in his *Origines gentium*, (now lately publish'd in 1724) has given such a satisfactory Account of what belongs to the *Horites*, that all Scruples vanish, and the nine Verses maintain their Ground. These and the like Instances may be of Use, to recommend Caution and Modesty in Criticizing; and may teach us to wait long, rather than come to Extremities. There are still many Things in *Scripture*, as well as in *Nature*, which are to be brought to light by Degrees, and may remain

main as useful Matter for future Inquiries.

Our Bible, after all, is a very good Bible, and our *Hebrew* Text a very pure Text: Which, Mr. *Whiston* himself might have perceived before this, had he but taken as much Pains as our Author has done, to make himself Master of it; or if he had but had as strong an Inclination and Desire to understand it, as he has to mend it.

While this Preface was printing, I received from the learned Author, by a common Friend, an Account of such Books as he hath already publish'd, or is going to publish; which I shall here insert, omitting only the two before-mention'd.

Publish'd.

Dissertationes ii. de veterum Philosophorum sententiis circa naturam Dei, *Lips.* 1699.

Dissert. de Synagogâ cum honore sepultâ. *Altorfii.* 1702.

Dissert. de Ecclesiæ Judaicæ Prophetis, in genere. *Lips.* 1714.

Dissert. de pluralitate personarum in unâ Dei essentiâ, ex 2 Sam. vii. 23. *Lips.* 1720.

Dissert. de eleemosynis Judæorum)
צדקה

Dissert. de Deo caliginis incolâ, ex 1 Reg. viii. 12.) 1728.

Now in the Press.

Dissert. de discalceatione religiosâ in loco sacro, ad Exod. iii. 5. & Jos. v. 15.

Promised.

P R E F A C E. xv

Promised.

Nova Editio Goodwini libri, *Moses & Aaron* dicti: cum uberioribus annotationibus ejusdem.

Antiquitates Biblicæ ex *Genesi & Exodo*.

Moses Marcus.

A View

A View of the CHAPTERS.

- Chap. I. *Of the uncorrupted Reading of the Hebrew Bible, being one and the same, as well in the Primitive, as in the modern Copies, against Mr. Whiston's Ist and III^d Proposition.* pag. 3
- Chap. II. *Of the Citations out of the Old Testament made in the New, against Mr. Whiston's XIIIth Prop.* 105
- Chap. III. *Of the State and Condition of the Septuagint Greek Translation, in ancient and modern Copies, against Mr. Whiston's II, IV, and VII Prop.* 183
- Chap. IV. *Of the divine Original of the Song of Songs, and its canonical Authority, industriously opposed by Mr. Whiston in his Supplement to his Treatise separately publish'd at London, A. D. 1723.* 195
- Chap. V. *Of the genuine and primitive Character of the Hebrew Letters, against Prop. V.* 227
- Chap. VI. *About the Spuriousness of the Samaritan Pentateuch, against Prop. VI.* 236
- Chap. VII. *Of the Citations of the Texts of the Bible in the Writings of the Fathers of the ancient Church, against Prop. VIII.* 251
- Chap. VIII. *Of Josephus and his scriptural Citations and Chronology, against Prop. IX, X, XI.* 261
- Chap. IX. *Of the pretended Corruption designedly brought into the Hebrew and Greek Copies by the Jews, against Prop. XII.* 284
- Chap. X. *An Examination of those Helps which Mr. Whiston recommends as proper to be made use of, in order to restore the true original Text of the Old Testament.* 332

THE
AUTHOR'S
PREFACE.

IT is certainly the Duty of all Men, reverently to receive, religiously to weigh, and more especially with grateful Heart to convert to their own Benefit what Revelations the divine Clemency hath consigned to them in the Holy Scriptures, that from thence they may carefully and studiously imbibe the pure genuine Knowledge of God our Saviour, with the Way and Means of attaining everlasting Felicity; and as well the right Nature and Manner of divine Worship, as the several Branches of their Practice. But widely different is the Conduct of some in our Days, who employ all their Wit to bring the sacred Oracles under Suspicion of Corruption, not only endeavouring to persuade ignorant People, that partly by the Injury of Time, partly by the sacrilegious Hand of ill-designing Men, they have suffered great Variety of Corruptions, and are become more confused and uncertain than the *Sybilline* Writings; but pretending also (if it shall please Heaven) to evince and demonstrate this by Reason and Argument.

B

But

But after that learned and religious Men had manfully and solidly refuted such unsuccessful Attempts of *John Morinus*, *Lud. Cappellus*, *Jsa. Vossius*, *Richard Simon*, *Marcus Meibomius*, *Paul Pezron*, and others, (who indeed had no such very bad Designs, but being imposed upon by an over Fondness for profane Criticism, made a very bad Use both of their Time and Wit, for overturning the Authority of the Holy Scripture) it was hoped, that all Men would desist from making any more injurious Attempts upon that sacred Book, and with open Arms would embrace and reverence its unblemished Authority. But *England* always productive of Prodigies, some Years ago brought a new Monster upon the Stage, rais'd up from the lurking Holes of the ancient Enemies of the Bible, but appearing under another, and as it were, a new Face, or rather a Vizard. *William Whiston*, once publick Professor of Mathematicks at *Cambridge*, but since deprived for his broaching the *Arian* Heresy, is the Person that has produced it, in his Book intituled, *An Essay towards restoring the true Text of the Old Testament, and for vindicating the Citations made thence in the New Testament*: And that increased with a Four-fold Appendix, (which hath no Relation to our present Purpose) he published at *London* in 8^{vo}. A. D. 1722. There hath not appeared in our Days an Enemy to the Scripture, more destructive, or better furnished, whether we consider him with Respect to his great Endowments of Wit and Learning, or his mortal Hatred to the Word of God; who under the specious Pretext of sacred Criticising, might both sharpen the formerly blunted Weapons of *Cappellus* against the *Hebrew* Code; and might also point the new ones, which *Pezron* had lent him, with greater Malignancy. The more dangerous
and

P R E F A C E. iii

and mischievous the Insults of this Man against the Dignity of the Old Testament are, as imposing upon the Simple, under an Appearance of Novelty, and suited to the Taste and Humour of the Age; so much the more necessary is it for the good of the Church, that pious and learned Men, with joint Counsels and Labours, should exactly, solidly, and copiously confute them, wipe away the Calumny thrown upon the sacred Books, and assert and preserve to them their Dignity safe and intire. Mr. *Whiston* hath, indeed, met with Opponents among his own Countrymen, who, though with a different View or Intention, have repelled his insolent and hostile Attacks. To this Purpose appeared at London, Anno 1724. in 8^{vo}. *The pretended Authority of the Clementine Constitutions, confuted by their Inconsistency with the inspired Writings of the Old and New Testament, in Answer to Mr. Whiston; By Richard Smalbrooke, D. D.* and Canon Residentiary of Hereford, &c.* In which Treatise the Author, *Richard Smalbroke*, comparing the Apostolical Constitutions with the Oracles of Scripture, proves the former not to be authentick; but confining himself to that Argument, he hath not so much as attack'd, much less overthrown, Mr. *Whiston's* intire System. But a little before 1723. was published *A Defence of the Canon of the Old Testament: Or, an Answer to Mr. Whiston's Supplement to his late Essay; in which he attempts to prove, that the Canticles is not a sacred Book of the Old Testament; By William Itchener, M. A. Rector of Christian Malford, Wilts.* But here the Author only defends the Authority of the Song of Solomon, and touches not further upon any Argument of Mr. *Whiston's*.

* Now Lord Bishop of St. David's;

iv *The* *AUTHOR's,*

A certain anonymous Author, whom we understand to be *Anthony Collins*, hath written *A Discourse of the Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion: In two Parts; The first, containing some Considerations on the Quotations made from the Old in the New Testament, and particularly on the Prophecies cited from the former, and said to be fulfilled in the latter; The second, containing an Examination of the Scheme advanced by Mr. Whiston in his Essay, &c.* London 1724. But so far is he from seriously pleading the Cause of the Holy Scriptures, that he rather falls into the same Opinion with Mr. *Whiston*, only in a different Manner; and in his sceptical Way of speaking, he brings the Authority of Scripture into still greater Danger, and exposes Religion, and all divine Revelation to Ridicule. Wherefore that we may not seem to have betrayed the Trust committed to us, and to have been wanting in Defence of so good a Cause; I, indeed, both in Consideration of my Office, and mov'd with the strict Connection of the Work which I have begun upon *Sacred Criticism*, thought it my proper Business, according to the Measure of my Abilities, diligently to enquire into the Mind of the Author, to examine, discuss, and overthrow his Arguments, with which he endeavours to impose upon the Ignorant. In which Work I shall, with all possible Brevity, explain the Words of the Author, plead the Cause of the Oracles which he distorts and accuses of Corruption, and disperse the Calumnies which he throws upon the most holy Word of God. I have no Design to expose the Character of a learned Man, nor to seek the Laurel from invidious slandering of others, but I resolve to keep my self within the Bounds of Piety and Modesty, and by avoiding every Thing foreign, to insist only upon what is to the Purpose, and wholly to devote
my

P R E F A C E. v

my self to Truth alone. And therefore if any Man think that sometimes I express my self too sharply, let it neither be attributed to Passion, nor Hatred conceived against my Adversary, whose Wit and Learning I respect; but to the provoking Nature of the Thing, and the just Grief and Trouble it gives me, to see the Holy Scriptures so unhandsomly treated.

But first of all I humbly beseech God, mercifully to favour my pious Intention, and so to direct all these my Endeavours by the Illumination of his Holy Spirit, that they may tend both to the Advantage of the Church, and of the learned Youth.

PREFACE

THESE NOTES ARE THE RESULT OF A COURSE OF LECTURES
GIVEN AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO IN THE
WINTER OF 1901. THE LECTURES WERE
GIVEN BY THE AUTHOR, AND THE NOTES
WERE TAKEN BY THE AUTHOR. THE
NOTES ARE THE PROPERTY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, AND ARE
NOT TO BE REPRODUCED OR
CIRCULATED IN ANY MANNER
WITHOUT THE PERMISSION OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

INTRODUCTION.

IN the first Place, that we may know the Author's Mind more fully and exactly, we shall set down his own System in his own Words, as they are in the Beginning of his Treatise; His Positions are these.

That the *Hebrew* Text of the Old Testament remained uncorrupted and entire to the Time of Christ and his Apostles, (*Prop. 13.*) And that the *Greek* Version of the seventy Elders was exactly agreeable to it. (*Prop. 2.*) As also the *Samaritan* Pentateuch, (*Prop. 6.*) But when towards the Close of the first Century after the Nativity of Christ, the *Jews* were hard press'd by the Christian Doctors; in the Beginning of the second Century they entred upon this rash Expedient, to corrupt and deprave those Texts, which were made Use of against their Treachery and Infidelity. To this End they changed the Primitive Character of the *Hebrew* Bible, which was the *Samaritan*, for another which is the *Chaldean* or *Assyrian*, that what Corruptions they brought in, might be the less taken Notice of. (*Prop. 5.*) That they also purposely corrupted in many Places, both the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Bibles, that the *Jews* might object and quote Texts of Scripture otherwise to the Christians, than they read or quoted them, (*Prop. 12.*) Whence it may follow, that although the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Text of the Old Testament, such as it now is, generally speaking, may be the same with that,

B 4

which

which was from the Beginning, (*Prop. 1.*) yet that in many Places, it differs very much from those Copies which were used in the Time of *Christ* and his Apostles, (*Prop. 3.*) To which Mischief, that the Author might apply a Remedy, and that he might bring back our Text to the same Case it was in before it was corrupted; towards the End of the Book † he proposes Ways and Means, by the Use and Aid whereof, the Old Testament may be restored to its full Perfection, in which it was read from the first Consecration of the Canon of the Scripture, and in the Time of *Christ* and his Apostles.

This is the general Plan of Mr. *Whiston's* Scheme, which that he may varnish over, and give it some faint Appearance and Resemblance of Truth, rather than real Strength, he makes Use of a Mathematical Method, and includes all he has to say in thirteen Propositions, every one of which Propositions he would endeavour to make us believe, by a more ample Declaration and pretended Proof. In discussing of which, that we may neither be impos'd upon by a specious Pretence of Method, nor obliged to repeat the same Thing over and over again, we shall reduce the whole Contents to certain Heads, the Explanation of which shall regularly and clearly exhaust and overthrow all Mr. *Whiston's* mighty Preparations.

† Pag. 329, 11.

CHAP.

C H A P. I.

Of the uncorrupted reading of the Hebrew Bible, being one and the same, as well in the Primitive, as in the Modern Copies.

Mr. Whiston's PROPOSITION I. Page I.

The Text of the Old Testament, generally speaking, in the History, Laws, Prophecies, and Psalms, is the same now that it ever has been from the utmost Antiquity.

BUT by no Means believe, that the Author hath thus express'd himself, in Order to defend and vindicate the Perfection of the Scripture. For having granted a general Agreement, at least, of our Text with the ancient and genuine one, immediately (Prop. 3.) he complains, that great Corruptions had crept into it. Therefore he grants that our Bible is the same with the old one, and that the Argument of all its Parts is the same; but he impugns its Purity, and in that Respect alledges, that its Text is changed; that it is the same as to the Substance of its Contents, but that in the several Parts, it is far different as to the Phrase, Disposition, and Form of them; yea, and chiefly as to the Sense.

PROP.

PROP. III. Page 17.

Our Hebrew Copies of the Old Testament in very many Places, differ from the Hebrew and Greek Copies, which were extant in the Time of Christ and the Apostles.

1. Thus the Author comes to the Pinch of the Question: And that he may defend his own Hypothesis, he produces a great Number of Examples, by which he pretends to prove, that the *Hebrew Bible* suffer'd great Corruptions in the Beginning of the second Century. We shall now subjoin Answers to the several Particulars.

OBJ. I. " He appeals to the Chronology, " which was greatly corrupted in the *Hebrew Bible*, especially in Respect of the Times which " followed next after the Flood. To this Purpose he reduces into a Table the different Accounts of the Years of the Patriarchs, by *Josephus*, the *Samaritan Pentateuch*, the modern " Septuagint, and our *Hebrew Text*, that the " Disagreement of these differing Accounts may " appear the more plainly before our Eyes: Then " he industriously quarrels with, and criticizes " some Computations, that he may prove it necessary to correct the *Hebrew Text* by the *Samaritan Account*.

ANSW. This is no new Calumny thrown upon the *Hebrew Text* on Account of its Chronology, before and after the Flood, differing from the *Greek Bibles*; but it has been lately dress'd out, and brought again upon the Stage by *Ludov. Cappellus*, *Brian Walton*, *Joh. Morinus*, *Jf. Vossius*,
Pau.

Paul Pezron, in his *Antiquities of Times restored*,* and in his further *Defence of the same*. But the original Text has never wanted Advocates to plead its Cause against the Adversaries. Particularly, against Vossius, appeared Ant. Hulsius, in his Book *de authenticâ absoluta S. textus Hebræi*, and Christ. Schotanus, in *Bibl. Hist. S. de prima mundi ætate*, Pag. 174. &c. Against Pezron, Martianæus, and Lequien, in particular Treatises much worthy of Regard. Finally against all of them, but compendiously, Frid. Spanhemius.† We should weary our Readers, to trace this prolix Affair from its Original, and to enter upon a Dispute which hath been long since carefully and painfully discuss'd by others: *Longa est injuria, Longæ ambages*. But I shall dispatch this Matter in a few Words. The Computation of the *Greeks*, as also that of *Josephus*, exceeds the *Hebrew Bibles*, from *Adam* indeed to the Flood, no fewer than 600 Years: From the Flood again to the Birth of *Abraham*, in the 130th Year of the Age of *Terab* his Father, it exceeds 'em about 880 Years; but allowing different Readings in different Editions: So that in this Way of Reckoning, the Age of the World exceeds the common Æra, or Account, about 1480 Years. Here *J. Vossius*, and *Pezron*, tho' going different Ways, accuse the *Jews* of foul Play, in expunging 14 Centuries out of the sacred Text, from the Creation of the World to the Call of *Abraham*; as also in strangely shortening the Times of the Judges, lest it should be thought that the Time for the coming of the *Messias* was past already. We urge in Favour of the *Hebrew* Calculation, first, The constant reading of all the Copies, which harmoniously agree in the same Number of Years

* Cap. 3, 4, 5;

† *Chronol. Sac.* P. 2. c. 2. and 19.

without any Token of Corruption, and express the Numbers, not in Arithmetical Cyphers, nor by single Letters, in which it were easy to make a Slip, but in whole Words, which scarce leave any Room for Falsification or Fraud. Secondly, We plead the Harmony of the *Hebrew* Calculation, both with the whole Chronology and sacred History; no Part of which it directly opposes, destroys no Circumstance, makes no Contradiction, as is frequently done both by *Josephus* and the *Seventy*. Thirdly, We urge the Falsity of the Corruption charged; since they could never prove any such Thing, either by sufficient Witnesses, or by the Records of History: But that no such Thing could be done is evident, since there were innumerable Copies in the East, and in the *Babylonian* Schools, others again in the West, and in *Palestine*, many also in the Hands of *Christians*, *Syrians* and others, which it was next to impossible to bring together into one Place, and then to make them exactly correspond to one another in every Point. We absolutely deny, that any such Thing could be done after the Birth of *Christ*, because of the general Dispersion both of the *Jews*, and of the Bibles, almost over the whole World: But before *Christ*, our Enemies deny that it was done; neither was there any Necessity for doing of it, while the *Jews* still expected the coming of the *Messias*. On the other Hand, the Falsity of the *Greek* Calculation appears, first, from the remarkable Variation of Reading, observed by *Spanhemius*,* and others, which is a Token of a bad Cause, and a manifest Proof of Corruption. Secondly, From its Disagreement both from *Josephus* and the *Samaritan* Copy, less indeed from *Josephus* than

* c. l. in *canone epoche* 1. sq. F. 1. opp. pag. 221. sqq.

the *Samaritan*, from which also the other *Greek* Chronologers widely differ. Thirdly, This appears from the many Absurdities under which it labours, confounding the Truth of History: As for Example; when it makes *Metbuselab* 165 or 167 Years of Age when he begat his Son, and gives 802 Years more to him after *Lamech* was begotten, by which Means he must have lived 14 Years compleat after the Flood, which is absurd. Hence it is, that *Augustin* in his Book *de civ. Dei Lib. XV. cap. 11.* proposes this Question, Where was then *Metbuselab*, whether in the Ark, or in Paradise? &c. Fourthly, It may be more reasonably suspected, that the *Greek* Bibles were rather industriously corrupted than the *Hebrew*. For neither the Christians, who disputed with the *Jews* concerning the Time of the coming of *Christ*, nor the *Gentiles*, no nor the *Jews* of *Palestine* themselves, (a few of their learned Doctors being excepted) read the Bible in *Hebrew*, because of their Ignorance of that Language; but the *Greek* Bibles were perused by every Body. If then the *Jews* had attempted to vitiate the sacred Volumes, would they not rather have done it to those which lay open to all, which the Enemies of the *Jews* used, which the *Hebrews* could purchase most easily, and in greatest Plenty? For what Madness were it that they should leave the *Greek* Books intire to which the Christians appealed, and that all the Corruption should fall upon the *Hebrew* Copies, which the Generality were either unacquainted with, or slighted. Fifthly, Another Argument may be drawn from the Occasion of lengthening out and accumulating the Number of Years in the *Greek* Version, which was this. When the *Alexandrian Hellenists* were preparing this Version, they made it their Business to bring the Calculation of the Holy

Holy Bible, which they were translating into *Greek*, nearer to the Accounts of the *Egyptians*, and their boasted Dynasties; which by this Means seemed, in a great Measure, to be kept within the Bounds of the Creation, and *Noah's* Flood, if the Years of their Generations, and sometimes the Years of a Man's Life after his begetting of Children, as they made it in the Years of *Metbuselah*, were increased by the Addition of Centenaries.

OBJ. II. p. 34. " Secondly, He appeals to the
 " Errors admitted by Copists, both in Names and
 " Numbers, especially in those Books which were
 " published after the *Babylonish* Captivity. To
 " this Purpose he compares together the Genea-
 " logies, and the Sums of the Generations and
 " Families, taken out of *Genesis* and *Josbua*, with
 " the first of *Chronicles*, and out of *Ezra* with *Nebe-*
 " *miah*; and he sets down upon the opposite Page
 " the Differences which he found, whether with
 " Respect to Names or Numbers. Moreover,
 " he observes that a whole Paragraph is left out
 " of *Josb. xv. 60.* in the *Hebrew* Text, which is
 " thus inserted in the *Greek*. Θεκά, ἡ Ἐφραθά,
 " αὐτὴ ἐστὶ Βαιθλέεμ, ἡ Φαζώρ, ἡ Ἀϊτάν, ἡ Κυλὸν, ἡ
 " Τατάμ, ἡ Θωβὴς, ἡ Καρεμ, ἡ Γαλέμ, ἡ Θεθέρ, ἡ
 " Μανοχώ, πόλεις ἑνδεκά, ἡ αἱ κῶμαι αὐτῶν.
 " *Theco*, and *Epbratha*, that is *Betblebem*, and
 " *Phagor*, and *Ætham*, and *Culon*, and *Tatam*, and
 " *Thobes*, and *Carem*, and *Gallem*, and *Thetber*,
 " and *Manoco*, eleven Cities and their Villages;
 " Which Place, without doubt, the *Jews* have
 " eras'd. Likewise that *Josb. xxi.* after *ver. 35.*
 " two Verses are left out of the *Hebrew* Bibles,
 " which may be supply'd from the *Greek* and
 " vulgar *Latin* Translations. Then again, that
 " the *Hebrew* Text is not consistent with it self,
 " about

“ about the Age of *Reboboam*, whom we read to
 “ have been 41 Years old, when he began his
 “ Reign, 2 *Chron.* xii. 13. and yet we read, that
 “ he consulted with the young Men, that were
 “ grown up with him, 1 *King.* xii. 8, 10. upon
 “ which Account *Abija* his Son, 2 *Chron.* 13. 7.
 “ is said to have upbraided the ten Tribes, that
 “ they rebelled against his Father, when he was
 “ yet young and tender-hearted, and could not with-
 “ stand them. To this he adds, that *Solomon*
 “ married the Mother of *Reboboam* an *Ammoni-*
 “ *tes*, when he was well stricken in Years, and
 “ addicted to Idolatry. And therefore the Greek
 “ Bible of the Vatican says, that he began his
 “ Reign being 16 Years old, which Number
 “ however Mr. *Whiston* himself thinks faulty, and
 “ changes into 26 Years, as judging it more a-
 “ greable to the Age of *Reboboam*, a tender-
 “ hearted and young King, than 41. Finally,
 “ the Beginning of the Reign of *Azarias*, or
 “ *Uzzias*, King of *Judah*, 2 *Kin.* xv. 1. is referr’d
 “ to the Sixteenth Year of the Reign of *Rebo-*
 “ *boam* the second King of *Israel*, which *Josephus*
 “ hath apply’d better to the Fourteenth Year of
 “ the said *Jeroboam*.”

ANSW. Thus that *Asp* borrows Poyson from
 the Viper; to paint him out in the Words of
Tertullian:* He gathers all kind of Poysons,
 from whencesoever, against the Perfection of the
 Scripture, and is not asham’d to revive the Ac-
 cusations of others long ago exploded and
 refuted, if so be He may but cast a Mist
 before the Eyes of the unlearned and un-
 stable: But we shall take a particular Care, as
 is highly requisite, to throw it off. First, His
 first Pretence about the Dissonance of Names
 and Numbers in *Genesis* and 1st of *Chronicles*,

* *Adv. Marc.* l. 3. c. 8.

Ezra, and *Nebemiah*, He has pick'd up from *Spinosa*, *Grotius*, *Lud. Capellus*, and *Le Clerc*; whose Calumnies on this Head We have sufficiently answer'd in our *Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament* *; for the Difference of Names does not argue the Text to be corrupted. It is either Total, between Names plainly different of one and the same Person, and then it shows us that Men had two Names, which is evident in the Case of King *Azarias*, who is also called *Uzzias*; or else the Difference is partial, turning and changing the same Name a little, and then it is to be referr'd to the Diversity of Dialect, Pronunciation, Family, Tribe, or Province, of Times also and Ages, that the same Name should be express'd differently, by adding, taking out, or changing a Letter or two, or by a different pointing, which is customary among us, v. g. in the Name *Guilielmus* or *Willhelmus*, *Janus* or *Johannes*, *Jobus* and *Hiob*, &c. But the Variety of the Account of Families proceeds from this, that *Ezra* and *Nebemiah* give different Lists of that People. *Ezra* speaks of them who upon the King's Decree met in *Babylon*, many of whom, who had already given up their Names, afterwards repenting what they had done, continued still in *Babylon*, others perhaps died in their Journey, whence it is, that in some Places the Number is less in *Nebemiah* than in *Ezra*. Again, *Nebemiah* speaks of them who actually returned into *Judæa*, some of whom had not before given up their Names to *Ezra*, in the Catalogue of those who were to be transported, yet afterwards turning to be of a better Mind, and induc'd by their Love of their Native-Country, they un-

* Part 1. cap. 16. S. 6. p. 292. and cap. 18. S. 4. p. 315, &c.

dertook the Journey, and joyn'd Company with those who were returning, and by this Means, in some Places, made the Catalogue of *Nehemiah* larger than *Ezra's*. Upon these Accounts it is no Wonder that their Numbers don't agree.

Secondly, As to what Mr. *Whiston* mentions of the seven Cities of *Judah* omitted in *Josh. xv. 60*; He is not beholden to any Searches of his own for it, but he has taken it at second Hand from the *Critica Sacra* of *Cappellus**, who there charges the sacred Text with a Deficiency, but is answered by *Buxtorf*†. Indeed that Passage kept *Jerom* in Suspence, as he says in his *Comm.* on *Mic. v. 2.* upon these Words: *And thou Bethlehem, Ephrata, &c.* Here he owns that he was not clear about its Authority, whether it was eras'd out of the ancient Books, by the Malice of the *Jews*, that *Jesus Christ* might not appear to be descended of the Tribe of *Judah*, or whether it was added by the *LXX.* Interpreters; and so knowing nothing certainly of that Matter, he determines nothing: But *Cappellus* and Mr. *Whiston* make no Scruple to assert, that the *Hebrew Bibles* have suffer'd this Loss by the Perfidiousness and Fraud of the *Jews*. *Le Clerc* upon the Place rather inclines to say, that it was omitted by Chance, because this Paragraph ends the same Way as the others do, viz. with the Word *חָצְרֵיהֶן* *hhatzrehen*, *their Villages*; which kind of Omission is frequently to be found in ancient Manuscripts. But there is no Occasion for us to enquire so much into the Defect of the *Hebrew Text*, where indeed there is none, but rather to trace the first Original of the Gloss thus foisted into the *Greek Bible*. For when no *Hebrew Copy*, whether Manuscript

* L. IV. c. 14. S. 3. † *Anti-crit.* p. 2. c. 8. p. 689, &c.

or printed in the whole World could ever be produced, which contains these Words; (and it may be easily proved, that the *Jews*, although ever so desirous to do it, could never possibly contrive an universal Corruption of all the Copies) and since, moreover, there is not the least mention of these Words, either in the *Targum*, the *Masorites*, or the most ancient *Hebrew* Commentators: Add to this, that not above three or four of the *Greek* Copies have these Words, and neither do they all agree in the same Reading: Hence may we perceive pretty plainly, that this Insertion is of later Date, and foisted in, and was no more to be found in the first Editions of the *Septuagint* Translation, than in the *Hebrew* Originals. Whence *Andrew Masius*, in his Commentary upon the Place, testifies, that in his own *Syriac* Copy, written above a Thousand Years ago, this whole Paragraph was mark'd with *Obelisks*, and therefore was of old Time held spurious and supposititious: From whence it may appear probable indeed, that some Critick had noted upon the Margin of his Book, a fuller Recital of the *Jewish* Cities, taken from other Places of Scripture, for the relieving of his Memory, and for his private Use; which marginal Note, unskilful Copyists afterwards would needs have to be a Part of the sacred Text, and inserted it into the Text of *Joshua*. Neither could the *Jews* expect any Advantage to their Infidelity, nor would the Christian Cause sustain any Damage by omitting of this little Sentence. *Micah* ch. v. 1. prophesied, that *Christ* was to be born in *Bethlehem Ephrata*; and *St. Matthew* acquaints us that the Event answered exactly to the Prediction, fixing the Nativity of our Saviour, ἐν Βηθλεὲμ τῆς οὐ λῶδαίας, in *Bethlehem of Judea*, and Βηθλεὲμ γῆ Ἰούδα, thou *Bethlehem the Land of Judah*, cap. ii. 5, 6. So that whether this Paragraph be in

Joshua,

Josua, or not, it no way weakens our Faith of *Christ's* descending from the Tribe of *Judah*.

Thirdly, *Joh. Morinus* long since earnestly insisted upon the two Verses of *Josb. xxi.* to defame the *Hebrew Bible*, and to prove its Corruption; * but without any Reason, for they are wanting only in some Copies, but are read in many others of good Note, so that they are neither left out of all the Translations, nor printed Editions. For the very Reverend Mr. *Abicht* in his Dissertation made at *Leipsick Anno 1714.* about restoring the two Verses of *Josb. xxi.* hath professedly observed, that these Verses are in the most ancient *Paris MSS.* of the Royal, and Oratorian Library, as the *Benedictines* testify in their Edition of *Jerom's Works, Tom. I. Pag. 275.* They are also in the Royal MS. Copy at *Dresden*, and in the two Royal Copies at *Berlin* and *Dessau*, as the most famous *Jablonsky* informs us; finally in the two Copies at *Erfurt*, by the Testimony of the most famous Mr. *Michael*. And that the same Verses were found in those Manuscript Copies, from which likewise the best and most excellent Editions of the *Hebrew Bible* were printed, the *Complutensian* Edition (published *Anno 1517.* under the Correction and Care of *Cardinal Ximenes*) testifies: As also the Edition with the Annotations of *Vatablus*, or rather *Rob. Stephens*, printed by *Commelinus, Anno 1586.* Moreover the *Plantin* Edition, with the interlinear Version of *Xantes Pagninus*, and *Bened. Arias Montanus*; the Edition at *Frankfort, Anno 1595.* corrected by the *Jews*; the *Amsterdam* Edition, by *Rabbi Menasseh ben Israel, Anno 1639.* Finally, the *Antwerp, Paris, and English Polyglots* have the same. Although then the Second Edi-

* *Exercit. in Pentateuch. Samaritan, cap. IX. p. 355, &c.*

tion of the *Rabbinical Bible* of *Bomberg*, directed by *Rabbi Jacob ben Chajim*, omits these Verses, and the *Rabbinical Bible* of *Buxtorf*, with *Leusden's* and also *Clodius's*, the *Berlin* and *Optius's* Bibles follow in this Respect, because all of them were published according to the Pattern of the *Masora*. Yet the older and the first Edition of the *Rabbinical Bible* at *Venice*, Anno 1517. by *Felix Pratensis*; as also other Editions of a lesser Size in 4^{to}. Anno 1521, 1544. by *Bomberg*, read the same. Moreover, the *Chaldee*, *Syriack*, *Arabick*, *Ethiopic*, and *Greek* Translations, and many Manuscript *Latin* Copies, acknowledge the same Verses; wherefore also *Luther* in his *German* Translation inserted them in the Text. The very Context necessarily demands and requires those Verses; for if they were taken away, then the Cities of the Tribe of *Reuben*, which were given to the *Merarites*, would be wanting; v. 7. neither can the Number of the twelve Cities given to the *Merarites*, according to the 40th v. nor can the Sum of forty eight Cities, assigned to the *Levites*, according to the 41st v. be made up. Therefore our *Glassius*,* and *Hottinger*,† have vindicated them solidly, and with Strength of Reason; the first against *Gordon Huntley* the *Jesuit*, and the last against *Morinus*: Which Things, if *Mr. Whiston* had duly weighed and considered, he would not have presumed to reproach the Scripture again, nor to bid Defiance to the Truth, and withal to give a helping Hand to the *Papists*: Indeed the Imputation of Corruption, which at most is only in some Copies, is very unskillfully, not to say insidiously, alledged against the *Hebrew* Copies in general, and without Exception. This Accusation, indeed, has received most Countenance

* *Phil. s. l. i. tr. i. p. 60, &c.*
cap. 2. Quæst. IV. p. 179, &c.

† *Theol. Phil. lib. I.*

from the Authority of the *Masora*, both of the great textual one, which (upon this Place) hath omitted the Cities mentioned in these two Verses, out of the Catalogue of those which are observed in this Chapter to be set down with the Article *na Eth, The*, as also the Final one, which reckons up 656 Verses of the Book of *Joshua*, omitting, and not numbering with them, these two Verses; which, if they were put into the Book, they should increase the Number of Verses to 658. This would be an Argument of Moment, if the *Masora* had come perfect and uncorrupted to our Hands: But when it is so perplexed, ambiguous, and corrupted, partly enlarged with novel Interpolations, partly mutilated and curtailed; and in the printed Copies, which owe their first Being to *R. Jacob ben Chajim*, they widely differ from the Manuscripts, it cannot be supposed to be a sufficient Evidence against the Faith of so many Copies of the Bible. It is well known how much the *Masora*, in reckoning up the Verses, differs both from the *Talmud*, as also from the modern Distinction of Verses; so that in some Books, the Text remaining intire, yet the Reckoning of the *Masora*, and of our Bibles, produces a very unequal Number of Verses. But the worthy *M. Abicht* takes Notice, that the Observation which counts up how often *na Eth The*, occurs in this Chapter, and omits these two Verses, was at last added to the *Masora* after the Time of *R. Hajj*, and from a defective Copy, which had been vitiated in this Place. Therefore neither Part of this Objection is of Weight enough to cancel these Verses, or to put them out of Possession of their just Title.

Fourthly, It is too bold an Attempt, and for which there is no Necessity, to lessen the Age of *Rehoboam*, when he began his Reign, which is twice expres-

ly determined*, and against the Faith of all, both Hebrew and Greek Copies, to deprive him of seventeen Years of his Age. For the young Counsellors, who had grown up with *Reboboam*, are not so called upon Account of the Years they had lived, but in Opposition to the old Counsellors who had served *Solomon*; so that although they might be above Forty Years of Age, yet they were much inferiour to them whom his Father had employed in his Service, both with Respect to their Age and Offices. Moreover, when the same is called נער *Nabar*, a Boy and tender†. It was not to be understood of his Years, but of his Mind and Manners; as *David*, when he was above Thirty Years of Age, calls himself a weak, or tender King‡. For learned Men have long since proved, that that Description is suitable to one who was educated delicately, who had no Experience in Business, was but little accustomed to Toil and Labour, and who was altogether a Stranger to the troublesome Cares of the Commonwealth: And that *Abija* meant not his Youth, but his effeminate Mind, the following Words inform us: —
ורחבעם היה נער ורך לבב ולא התחזק לפניהם. *Reboboam was young and tender hearted, and could not withstand them.* But it is altogether uncertain, and the Scriptures are silent about the Time when *Solomon* married the *Ammonitess*, who was Mother of *Reboboam*. The Scripture plainly insinuates, that he married strange Wives a long Time before he was enticed by them to Idolatry, and he might before, or immediately after his Father's Death have married her; and as he reign'd Forty Years, *Reboboam* may well be supposed to be about Forty one Years of Age when he succeeded his Father in his Kingdom. Finally, what

* 1. Kings xiv. 21. and 2. Chron. xii. 13. † 2. Chron. xiii. 7. ‡ 2. Sam. iii. 39.

Mr. *Whiston* speaks of the *Vatican Copy*, giving only Sixteen Years to *Rehoboam*, is manifestly false*; the *Greek Bibles*, the *Roman*, *Complutensian*, *Aldus's*, &c. in both the Places quoted, read it, καὶ τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη ἐπὶ, Ῥεβοάμ ἐν τῷ βασιλεῦσαι αὐτόν, κ. τ. λ. And *Rehoboam* was Forty one Years old when he began to reign, &c. Neither has the great Store of various Readings, which *Lamb. Bos.* hath subjoined to the Edition of *Franecker*, produced or quoted any Copy, which reads this otherwise; so that one cannot easily conjecture, by what Copy,† or by what Testimony Mr. *Whiston* hath suffered himself to be imposed upon.

Fifthly, Our Adversary, without any Necessity, confounds all chronological Accounts, about the Years of *Uzzias*, or rather those of *Jeroboam*, when he prefers the Account of *Josephus* to the Scriptural Computation. For the Reign of *Jeroboam* the 2^d admits of a double Calculation; First, as he was adopted into a Participation of the Government by his Father, in the Year of the World 3168. Or, Secondly, it may be reckoned from the Death of his Father *Joahas*, A. M. 3179. from which Time he reigned alone. Therefore the Scripture Calculation is very consistent, which throws the beginning of the Reign of *Uzzias*, or *Azarias*, upon the 27th Year of the Reign of *Jeroboam*, King of *Israel*, reckoning from the Time he was made Partner with his Father in the Kingdom, which is just the Sixteenth Year of *Jeroboam*, since he reigned alone. Therefore *Josephus* must be mistaken, who in † his *Antiquities* says, that *Uzzias* succeeded to his Father *Amazias*, Ἔτος ἦδὲ τέταρτον πρὸς τοῖς δέκα βασιλεύοντος Ἰεροβοάμ, in the

* 1 Kings xiv. 21. 2 Chron. xii. 13. † Mr. *Whiston*, I suppose, took it from 1 Kings xii. 24. as represented in the Roman Copy of the Seventy, which there has a very large Interpolation unknown to the other Copies. *Moses Marcus*. ‡ *Lib. IX. cap. 11.*

14th Year of the Reign of Jeroboam, thus taking two Years from the Reign of Jeroboam by himself: But the Scripture is in no Mistake, the Calculations whereof we have settled in our *Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament*.*

OBJ. III. Page 48: " He appeals to the manifold Differences of the *Hebrew* Text, as it now stands, from the *Samaritan*. For in an *Appendix* he has given a large Catalogue of the Places in which the *Samaritan* Pentateuch differs from the *Hebrew*. And from hence he thinks it demonstrable, that the ancient Copies of the Law belonging to the two Tribes, agreed much more exactly with the present *Samaritan*, than with the present *Hebrew*. The Version of the *Septuagint* also, even as it stands now, abating such Places where it has been corrected to the present *Hebrew*, does commonly attest to the Truth of the *Samaritan* Reading, in Opposition to the *Hebrew*. Nay farther, the same *Samaritan* Copy is also frequently confirmed by the plain Truth of Facts, the Nature of Things, and the genuine Construction of the *Hebrew* Language. So that all this put together, the *Samaritan* Pentateuch, that inestimable Treasure to the Christian Church, does evidently prove, that the present *Hebrew* Copy has been not a little corrupted in these latter Ages.

ANSW. Mr. *Whiston* would never have touched upon this Argument, if he had not ploughed with *Morinus's* Heifer; and yet *Morinus* was so effectually chastised by *Hottinger*, that he durst not mutter one Word of Reply. He in his *Exercitationes* against *Morinus*,† hath evidently demonstrated to the Eye, that the Person who put the

* P. I. Art. I. Chap. XIV. S. 5. P. 257. &c. † S. 40. and following Pages.

Pentateuch into a *Samaritan* Dress and Character, took it out of the *Hebrew* Copy, and by his mistaking and confounding the *Hebrew* Letters, hath made very remarkable Blunders in the *Samaritan* Pentateuch, and coined monstrous Words; and in some Places hath designedly corrupted the Text, and added to it many Insertions of his own, supported by no Authority. Therefore it is not to be wondered at, if the *Samaritan* Text so often differs from the *Hebrew*, which made it easy for Mr. *Whiston* to compile a large Catalogue of those Variations. But we avowedly declare that it is utterly false, that the same *Samaritan* Pentateuch agrees more with the ancient than the modern *Hebrew*, and that any such Thing can be proved by the plain Truth of Facts, the Nature of Things, or the genuine Construction of the *Hebrew* Language. For hath Mr. *Whiston* ever seen the old Pentateuch of the two Tribes, and compared it with the *Samaritan*? Hath he ever demonstrated, or evidently perceived, that the old Bible of the two Tribes was different from the *Hebrew* one which we have now? Let Mr. *Whiston* judge, whether the *Hebrew* Text,* more agrees to the Truth of History, where *Rebecca* says of her self, וָאֶעֱשָׂה אוֹתָם *Vaëssa Outam*, And I will make them savoury Meat, for thy Father, or the *Samaritan*, which for the first Person in the Future, makes it the second in the Imperative, עֲשֵׂה *Æssa*, make thou; when immediately in the 14th Verse it follows וַתַּעֲשֶׂה אִמּוֹ *Vataaßs Emou*, And his Mother made Savoury Meat of the Kids which he brought: Also † where the *Hebrew* Pentateuch four Times repeats the Word הַסֹּחַר *Hassochar*, the Prison, for which the *Samaritan* absurdly puts down, הַסֹּחַר, *Hassochar*, the Merchant: Also ‡

* Gen. xxvii. 9.
xiv. 24.

† Gen. xxxix. 20. &c.

‡ Exod.

where it is said of God, וַיַּבֵּחַ, *Vayabam*, and he troubled the Egyptians, in Place of which the Samaritan reads, וַיַּחֲבֵחַ, *Vayacham*, and he warmed the Egyptians: And* where the Hebrew Text has סָרוּ מִמָּחֵר, *Saru maber*, they turned aside quickly, the Samaritan reads סָרוּ מִמָּחֵר, *Saru Macher*, they went over to morrow; which is a Contradiction in Terms.† Where the First-Born is called רִאשִׁית אוֹנוֹ, *Rasbeth Ounou*, the beginning of his Strength, the Samaritan reads גְּנוֹנוֹנוֹ, *Gnawonnou*, of his Iniquity, meaning of the Father of the Family, &c. Is it agreeable to the Nature of Things, that when amongst them, who, for some Blemish of the Body‡ were debarr'd from the Priesthood, the Hebrew Text mentions חָרוּם, *Charum*, him who is lame in his Limbs, the Samaritan reads גְּנוּם, *Gnarum*, signifying, crafty, subtle, or naked? Does it agree to the Genius of that Language, when** God says of himself אֶתְוַדַּעְתִּי, *Athwadang*, I shall make my self known, in the first Person, that the Samaritan altogether incongruously sets down the third Person, הֵתְוַדַּעְתִּי, *Hathwadang*, He will make himself known? Numberless other Examples of like Kind are to be seen, by which the Samaritan Text may be convicted of Falsity, if these be not sufficient. But it is chiefly observable, that when†† the Hebrew Copy, and conformable thereto all Interpreters have it, Set up those Stones בָּרַךְ עִיבַל upon Mount Ebal, the Samaritans, who were mighty fond of their Mount Gerizim, by a sacrilegious Fraud have put in Place of it הָרַם גִּרְזִים Mount Gerizim: And as if this were not enough, they used both to write and repeat the Words just now mentioned instead of the

* Exod. xxxii. 8.
xxi. 18.

† Deut. xxi. 17.
** Numb. xii. 6.

‡ Lev.
†† Deut. xxvii. 4.

Tenth Commandment*. Mr. *Whiston* is not the first who informed us, that the *Septuagint* Copy agrees much more with the *Samaritan* Pentateuch than with our *Hebrew* Bible; for learned Men have observed the same long before him: And the famous *Hottinger*† hath demonstrated the same by a great Number of Examples. And yet it does not follow from thence, that the *Hebrew* Text, at the Time when it was translated into *Greek*, did exactly agree with the *Samaritan*, and that afterwards in the End of the first Century it was depraved: Learned Men have rather concluded from this, that the *Greek* Version hath either been made from the *Samaritan*, or revised and interpolated by it. And now let Mr. *Whiston*, with his *Morinus*, go and boast of his *Samaritan* Pentateuch, the inestimable Treasure of the Church, (if it please Heaven) and the genuine, original, and pure *Mosaical* Copy! Let him only consult and well weigh *Buxtorf's Anti-Crit.*‡ and let him first shew himself an able Man in confuting that Treatise, before he presume to prefer the *Samaritan* to the *Hebrew* Text.

OBJ. IV. Page 49. “ He appeals further to
 “ the notorious Difference there is between the
 “ *Septuagint* Version, and the present *Hebrew*.
 “ For the most skilful in the *Hebrew* and the
 “ *Greek* Languages, who have exactly made that
 “ Comparison, do so evidently find, in many
 “ Places, that the Copies made Use of by those
 “ Interpreters, differs from those the *Jews* have
 “ since given us, that they are able, in not a few,
 “ nor inconsiderable Instances, to restore that an-
 “ cient Reading from the same Version; it
 “ appearing plain, that sometimes the mere

* Exod. xx. 17. † *Thef. Phil. L. I. C. III. S. 3. Quæst*
 4. p. 294. ‡ Part II. C. VII. p. 522, &c.

“ Change of a single *Hebrew* Letter, nearly resembling another; nay, that at other Times
 “ the mere Difference of Punctuation, which is
 “ intirely of a later Date, will give a clear Account of the Difference which is between
 “ them: As the very learned *Cappellus* in his famous Works relating to this Matter has proved
 “ at large, and that intirely to the Satisfaction of
 “ the Judicious.

ANSW. Our Critick comes now ingenuously to own, what Master has instructed him, and by whose Labours he has been assisted for the patching together his incoherent Lucubrations. But in how low an Esteem the Authority of *Cappellus* is with judicious and learned Men, how many publick Censures have been passed upon his profane Endeavours, how strenuously and solidly his absurd Cavillings against the *Hebrew Code* have been refuted and baffled, almost every Body knows, and needs no repeating. But Mr. *Whiston* either purposely plays the Sycophant, or discovers his great Ignorance in *Logicks*, while he takes for granted and confess'd by all, what was mainly incumbent upon him to prove. Let us admit that the *Greek*, which is called the *Septuagint*, differs very widely from the *Hebrew* Copy, yet it differs also so much from it self, that as many Editions of it as are to be seen this Day, so many various Readings may be observed; and no Man is so clear-sighted, as to be able to declare or inform us, which of them exactly agrees with the original *Greek* Text, or which of them is interpolated; what Changes, Transpositions, Additions and Mutilations, many of these Editions have suffered, partly from the Boldness of Criticks and ignorant Pretenders, partly from the Injuries of Time: And how many Things have been foisted into it, which change and confound the ancient and genuine

genuine Text of this Translation, from the Versions of *Aquila* and *Theodotion*, and other Greek Translators, out of the *Octapla* of *Origen*. Let our Disputant then first acquaint us, what Edition, what reading of this Version, he acknowledges for authentick and genuine; and then let him prove both its Genuineness and its Agreement and Harmony with the *Hebrew* Reading of the original Copy, from whence it was taken. Supposing then that this differs from the present *Hebrew* Reading, either by the Change of similar Letters, or by a different Punctuation; whether is it to be ascribed to the Supineness and Inadvertency of the Translators, or to the universal Corruption of all the *Hebrew* Copies? And since Mr. *Whiston* takes upon him the Defence of this last Supposition, he must prove the same by solid Reasons, before he impose the Belief of it upon the World. To illustrate this by an Example; when the Translators of *Psalms* xix. 5. rendered it εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ἐξῆλθεν ὁ φθόγγος αὐτῶν, *Their Sound went into all the Earth*; two Things must first be demonstrated, that in Place of קִיב, *Kavom*, the Interpreters in their Copy read it קִלָּם, *Kolam*, and that at that Time it was so read in all Copies; as also that that was the primitive Reading, and which *David* had by Inspiration from the Spirit of God, before he charges our reading with Falsity, and persuades us that it is corrupt; and thus let be it done as to every other Place which he with *Capellus* is pleased to cavil at. If that were the ancient and genuine *Hebrew* Reading, which is imagined to differ from the modern, because of the Variation of the *Greek* Copy, I very much wonder how it came to pass, that the *Chaldee* Translation, which was taken from the intire and pure Copies, should agree better with the modern *Hebrew* Copies (or to speak in Mr. *Whiston's* Way,

How

How it should long ago have been formed upon the same Plan with the corrupt reading that was to come after) than with the old and genuine Copies. Such always hath been the Dignity and Prerogative of authentick Writings, that when they differ from a Translation, the Error should be rather attributed to it, than to them; neither must their reading be put out of Possession, unless it be proved by most weighty Arguments, that it can no longer maintain its Place. Therefore that Conclusion is altogether absurd and rash, by which these false Criticks, from the Disagreement of the *Greek* Translation, attempt to bring the original Text into Suspicion of Corruption, or to charge it with Errors.

OBJ. V. Page 50. " He appeals further to the
 " Book of *Ezra* (or *Esdra*) which the *Jews* in
 " their Code have handed down to us mutilated
 " and corrupted, while the *Septuagint* and vulgar
 " *Latin* have preserved it compleat and intire.
 " There are two Books of *Esdra*, of which
 " the one which is esteemed *Canonical*, is much
 " shorter than the other which they call *Apocryphal*. From the Citations of *Clemens* of *Alexandria*, *Tertullian*, *Origen*, *Cyprian* and *Eusebius*, who quoted no other Book of *Esdra* but
 " the *Apocryphal* one, as also from *Josephus*, who
 " made Use of that same *Apocryphal* Book, it is
 " evident that the *Jews* in the first Century, read
 " the same Book of *Esdra* in their Copy, and
 " esteemed it *Canonical*; which *Apocryphal* Book
 " we unjustly reject. Neither did the Christians
 " read any other till *Jerom's* Time, who introduced into the Christian Church this corrupted
 " *Hebrew* Book in Place of the former. Since
 " then in this one Book, even from the Time of
 " *Josephus*, the *Jews* have taken away one third
 " Part of the History; by this Example we are
 " admo-

“ admonished, not rashly to believe *Jerom*, that
 “ all those Books, which the Christians received
 “ from the *Jews*, are the same with them which
 “ were reckoned up in the Canon in the Days of
 “ *Philo*, *Josephus*, of our Saviour *Christ* and his
 “ Apostles. Yet he accuseth this very *Apocryphal*
 “ Book of *Esdras*, which he would have us be-
 “ lieve to be *Canonical*, of Dislocations and Trans-
 “ positions. Moreover, he thinks it plain, by
 “ comparing the Book of *Nebemiah* with the same
 “ History of *Josephus*, that it is not read so full
 “ and perfect in our Copies at this Day, as it was
 “ in that Copy of the Canon which *Josephus* used.
 “ Finally, Mr. *Whiston* suspects the *Greek* Tran-
 “ slation of *Ezra* and *Nebemiah*, not to be the an-
 “ cient one done by the Seventy Elders, but
 “ that of *Theodotion*.

ANSW. Verily what the Philosopher says is
 justly applicable to Mr. *Whiston*'s Conceits, τὸ ἀ-
 ληθὲς ἓν, τὸ δὲ ψεῦδος πολυσχεδές, *Truth is one, but*
Error is infinite. These Things are so incoherent,
 that now he throws upon St. *Jerom*, and the End
 of the Fourth Century, the Depravation of the
Hebrew Copies, which just before he had referred
 to the Beginning of the Second Century, blaming
 the *Jews* for delivering those depraved Books to
 the Christians. But to the Point in Hand. First,
 We must understand that the Book which the *La-*
tins call the Third Book, the *Greeks* call the First
 Book of *Esdras*; and those which the *Latins* call
 the First and Second, are reckoned as one by
 the *Greeks*, and by them named the Second Book
 of *Esdras*. Thus in that *Synopsis* of the Scrip-
 ture which is attributed to *Athanasius**, only two
 Books of *Esdras* are taken Notice of; the first of
 which dates the Privilege granted to the *Jews*,

* T. 2. opp. p. 83.

of returning out of their Captivity, from the Story in which *Zerobabel* is said to have spoken most accurately to the Question, *what is strongest*; which Story we read 1 *Esdra*s*. The Second Book gives Account both of their Return, and many other Particulars about *Esdra*s and *Nebemiah*. There is the same Way of numbering and placing them in some Editions of the *Greek Bible*, viz. in the *Aldin*, which divides the first of *Esdra*s into 109 Chapters, marked upon the Margin of the Text, and likewise in the *Roman Edition* of Pope *Sixtus*. Whence it is not to be wondered at, that the Fathers of the *Greek Church*, and *Josephus*, who used the *Greek Copy* of the Bible, esteemed, read and cited this *Apocryphal Book* as *Canonical*. Neither does the Suffrage of *Tertullian*, *Augustin*, and the *Carthaginian Fathers* give him any more Countenance than the other; since *Augustin*†, testifies, that the *African Church* used a *Latin Translation* of the Bible, which was taken from the common *Greek Version*, and followed its Authority. The Fathers of both Churches were led into Mistake from the same Cause, if they did mistake, and did not rather admit of, and read and cite the *Apocrypha*, as a divine Book, with the same Meaning as they did other ecclesiastical Books, and those controverted Writings annexed to the *Canon*; not because they were of equal Authority with the *Canonical uncontroverted Books*, but because with them they were read publicly in the Church; in such a Manner as we also sometimes quote Testimonies out of them, which being as it were supplemental to the *Canonical Books*, although they have not the same Authority of Proof, yet they serve to illustrate the Subject upon which one is treating. Some-

* Ch. iii. and iv.

† lib. XVIII. de civ. Dei. cap. 43.

times the Fathers went so far as to extoll the *Apocryphal* Books very highly, which yet they were far from esteeming equal to the *Canonical*. Thus *Clemens Alexandrinus*^a styles the Book of *Baruch* *divine Scripture*: *Cyprian*^b gives the same Title to the History of *Susanna*, and *Ambrose* also^c. *Cyprian* in another Book^d does the like by the *Book of Wisdom*, and *Cyril*^e by the Book of *Ecclesiasticus*, and *Cyprian* by^f the *Maccabees*. Finally, *Origen*^g judges the Book of *Hermas* to be divinely inspir'd: Notwithstanding which, Mr. *Whiston* himself would not reckon them all to the *Canon*. Secondly, We want not weighty and prevalent Reasons, why this Book should be out of the *Canon*. *Jerom*^h affords us one, expressing himself thus, *Neither need any Man take Offence, that one Book only hath been published by us, and that we cannot be in love with the Dreams of the third and fourth Books of the Apocrypha: For the Books of Esdras and Nehemiah are united in the same Volume by the Hebrews; and what are not allowed of by them, and do not belong to the twenty four old ones are to be rejected.* That he means by [*Viginti quatuor Senum*] the twenty four old Men, or old Ones, so many genuine Books of the *Hebrew Canon*, which he introduces under the Figure of the twenty four Elders spoken of *Revel. iv.* he in his Prefaceⁱ plainly declares. For the Christian Church received the *Canon* of the Old Testament from the Hands of the *Jews*^k, and in Consequence thereof disallow, and exclude out of the *Canon* all those which the Synagogue disowns. So that 'tis

^a Lib. 2. *Pædag.* cap. 3. ^b *Serm. de Lapsis.* ^c *De Spiritu Sancto*, cap. 8. ^d *De habit. Virg.* ^e Lib. 3. con. *Julian.* ^f Lib. 1. *Epist.* 3. ad *Cornel.* ^g Lib. 10. *Prælat. sup. Esdr. & Nehem.* Tom. 4. pag. 9. ⁱ In Prologo *Galeato.* ^k *Rom. iii. 2.*

in vain to require the Testimony of the ancient *Jews*, for affirming the divine Original and Authority of this *Apocryphal* Book, which the Christian Church will not allow to it. *Melito* of *Sardis* does not acknowledge it¹, nor *Gregory Nazianzen*^m, nor *Epiphanius*ⁿ, nor *Damascen*^o, nor the Council of *Laodicea*^p: And yet all of them give us exact Lists of the Books of the Bible. Moreover the Falsity of the History, and its contradicting those Books which are undisputably *Canonical*, are a certain Evidence of its Spuriousness: Pretended *Esdras* is false when ^q he says, that *Zerobabel* being a young Man was gone forth in the second Year of the Reign of *Darius*; who having been appointed Leader of them who returned into their native Countrey by Command of *Cyrus*^r, could not be under an hundred Years of Age in the Reign of *Darius* Notbus: *Esdras* is again false when ^s he tells us, that *Cyrus* had made a Vow, to return the Vessels of the Temple, and that *Darius* perform'd this Vow of *Cyrus*; which Vessels the true *Esdras* testifies ^t *Cyrus* himself to have taken out, number'd, and deliver'd to *Shezbazzar*, and that he accordingly carried off or transported them. He is again false, when ^u he refers to the second Year of *Darius*, the Building of the Altar, the laying the Foundations of the Temple, the Sacrifices, the *Sidonians* and *Tyrians* being hir'd to bring over Cedar-Trees from Mount *Libanus*, and other Circumstances of rebuilding the Temple; all which Things are recorded to have been done upon the first Return of the *Jews* in the Time of *Cyrus*^r. He is

¹ Euseb. lib. 4. Hist. Eccl. cap. 26. ^m Carmine 33.
 ὅτι τὸ γνήσιον βιβλίον τὸ θεοπνεῦμα γράφει. ⁿ Lib. de
 Mens. & Pond. cap. 4. ^o Lib. 6. de Orth. Fide, cap. 18.
^p Can. 60. ^q 1 Esdras iv. 58. ^r Esdras ii. 2. ^s ch. iv.
 44, 57. ^t ch. i. 7, &c. ^u ch. v. 2, &c. ^x Ezra ii. & iii.
 false

false when γ he describes the Dedication of the Temple in so confus'd and perplex'd a Manner, that it can by no means be adjusted to the third Chapter of *Esdra*s. For this consult *John Reynolds*, z who hath fully and purposely discuss'd that Subject. So also what Things this false *Esdra*s tells about the Building of the Temple, are a Contradiction to the Prophecy of *Haggai*: And his Narrative about the Building of *Jerusalem*, is in direct Opposition to the true History thereof.

Thirdly, Mr. *Whiston* is mistaken, when he pretends that this spurious Piece is a third Part more full and more compleat than the genuine Book of *Esdra*s, which Supposition, by comparing them together, is at first Sight refuted; for the supposititious Book has but nine, whereas the true *Esdra*s contains ten Chapters. But supposing, as our Critick would have it, that the *Jews* were injurious to this Book of *Esdra*s, what Advantage could they have reap'd by making of these Corruptions? These historical Passages, which the two Books report differently, do not advance one Syllable for defending or excusing the Infidelity of that obstinate Nation, so that there appears not the least Reason for their doing it. From whence it is

Fourthly, That this Rhapsody does not please even those of the *Romish* Communion, who in other Cases patronize the Apocryphal Books; for in the *Tridentine* Catalogue of the Canonical Scriptures (*Sess.* 4.) they thought fit to leave out the third and fourth Apocryphal Books of *Esdra*s; yea *Sixtus Senensis* and *Bonfrerius* avowedly reject-ed and impugn'd them. Compare *Bellarmino* a and *Gregory of Valencia* b .

γ Chap. v. 62, &c.

lect. XXX. & XXXI.

& lib. 2. cap. 1.

z Censuræ Libr. Apocryph. Præ-

a Lib. 1. de Verbo Dei, cap. 20.

b De Eccles. p. 335.

Fifthly, and lastly, If that Consequence should hold good, which our Critick draws from comparing *Josephus*, against the Perfection of the Book of *Nehemiah*, we should not at this Day have one Canonical Book intire as to the historical Part; for it is obvious, that *Josephus* useth too much Freedom in inventing, polishing, adding and diminishing Circumstances of Stories, Speeches, and Names, and thereby very often he turns aside from the Simplicity of the Canonical History; which Things being consider'd, I think no Man will be so bold as to affirm, that *Josephus* is preferable to the divine Records, or that the Canon of the Scripture is to be supply'd and restor'd from his History.

OBJ. VI. Page 55. “ Mr. *Whiston* next ap-
 “ peals to the Book of *Esther*, which wanting a
 “ quarter Part, is so much the shorter in our
 “ present *Hebrew* Copies than it was in the old
 “ Ones; for we there want a Copy of the King
 “ of *Media* and *Persia's* Letter for the Destructi-
 “ of the *Jews*; with the Copy of the Prayers of
 “ *Mordecai* and *Esther*. We want also an Ac-
 “ count of the Manner of Queen *Esther's* Ad-
 “ dress to the King, with a Copy of the King's
 “ Letter for the *Jews* Deliverance. All which
 “ yet really belong to this History, and are still
 “ in all Copies of the *Septuagint* Version. They
 “ were all evidently in *Josephus's Hebrew* Copy;
 “ and in the Copies of the first Christians. Nor
 “ do we hear of any Book of *Esther*, of Value
 “ in the Church, till the Days of *Jerom*, without
 “ them. But some other strange Additions in
 “ the modern Copies of the *Septuagint* Version,
 “ both at the Beginning and End of this Book,
 “ concerning a Dream of *Mordecai*; the Manner
 “ of the Discovery of the Treason of the two
 “ Eunuchs, and an Epistle of the Feast of Pu-
 “ rim,

“ *rim*, now lost, Mr. *Whiston* passes them over,
 “ because they are he thinks, wholly unsup-
 “ ported by all ancient Testimonies whatever;
 “ and indeed are very awkwardly plac’d where
 “ they stand at present. He says further, that
 “ many like Omissions are observable in the *Pen-*
 “ *tateuch* and *Chronicles*, and other Books of the
 “ Old Testament, which yet he forbears to en-
 “ large farther upon.”

ANSW. Here again our Critick falls foul upon his own Scheme, by saying that the *Hebrew* Copies came down to the Time of *Jerom* perfect and entire, when his main Design is throughout his whole Treatise to demonstrate, that they were corrupted about the Beginning of the second Century. But in this Point,

First, He either pretends, or betrays great Ignorance in the reading of the ancient Writers, while he is persuaded that the *Hebrew* Copies admitted and continued those Additions till the Time of *Jerom*; whereas *Origen* in express Words assures us, that long before, yea that always, they were kept out of the original Text; for thus he says in his Epistle to *Julius Africanus*: ‘Εκ τῆς Ἑβραίων, ὅτε ἡ τῆς Μαρδοχαίου διχὴν ὅτε ἡ τῆς Ἑβραίων οἰκοδομήσαι δυναμῆναι τὴν ἐν Ἰερουσαλὴμ, πρὸς Ἑβραίοις φέρων, αἰνὴν ἔδωκε αἱ Ἰουδαίαι, ἔδωκε ἡ τῆς Ἀμαν ἐπὶ καταστρέφει τὴν τῆς Ἰουδαίων ἐθνὸς γενομένην, ἔδωκε ἡ τῆς Μαρδοχαίου, ἐξ ὀνόματος Ἀρταξέρξεος ἀπολύσαι τὴν θανάτου τὸ ἐθνόν. Of the History of Esther, neither the Prayer of Mordecai, nor of Esther herself, which might edify the Reader, are in the Hebrew; nor yet the Letter of Haman written to destroy the Jews, nor the Epistle of Mordecai, written in the Name of Artaxerxes, in order to deliver that Nation from Death. Whence it is evident, that it is too roundly asserted, that all the *Hebrew* Copies of the Primitive Christians down to *Jerom*, contained those Supplements.

Neither, *secondly*, is this justly concluded from the Quotations of the primitive Fathers. Such a Conclusion is exceeding weak, to say no worse of it: The Fathers before *Jerom* read and cited the Supplements of *Esther*, therefore they read them in the *Hebrew Code*, which then contain'd them, tho' it afterwards lost them! For they us'd the *Greek*, and the *Latin Copy* which was taken from the *Greek*, as we have already mention'd; and when they quote it, they only appeal to the History, but do not alledge these Things as having equal Authority with the divine and canonical Writings, or as a Proof of Articles of Faith; which is clear from the Example of *Chrysostom* ^c where he quotes these Parts which are read in the *Greek Copy*, *chap. iv.* in the vulgar *Latin chap. xiv.* of *Esther*: And the like appears from the 199th Epistle of *Augustine* to *Edicia*.

Thirdly, He shews the same Strength of Argument in relying upon the Authority of *Josephus*, for who can allow of this Consequence: *Josephus* sets down two Epistles of *Abasuerus*, and the Prayer of *Mordecai*, therefore he took them out of the *Hebrew Copy*! Nay he shews by certain Evidences, that in his Book of *Antiquities* he follow'd the common *Greek Version*; and that not with such Fidelity as one would desire. To this agrees the Judgment of *Lucas Osiander* ^d, who speaks of him after this Manner: " Let not
" the Students of Theology give too much Credit to *Josephus*; for by comparing his History
" with the Holy Scripture we find, that some-
" times he perverts the Order of Things, some-
" times he mis-reports Matters of Fact: Some-

^c Hom. 3. ad Pop. Ant.
lib. 3. cap. 10.

^d Cent. 1. Hist. Eccl.

“ times also even as to Affairs transacted in his
 “ own Time, he reports them one way in his
 “ *Books of Antiquities*, and another in his Books
 “ of the *Jewish Wars*.” This I could demon-
 strate by Examples, but I study Brevity; yet I
 shall point to one or two Instances, to make good
 this Censure; particularly the Case of the *two*
Pillars which he reports * to have been built be-
 fore the Flood: Again ^e speaking of *Absalom*, he
 says that he had so much Hair, that it could
 scarcely be polled in eight Days Time; of which
 Fiction the Scripture is altogether silent, since it
^f only says, that *Absalom's* Hair grew so, that he
 was oblig'd to poll it once a Year, it being trou-
 ble some to him by reason of its great Weight.
 Moreover, let any Man look into Chapter the
 fifth of his second Book of *Antiquities*, and then
 try whether in the sacred Writings he can find
 out any such Things as are there told of *Moses*.
 If Mr. *Whiston* should from hence pretend to
 charge Omissions upon the *Pentateuch*, the *Chro-
 nicles*, and other Books of the Old Testament,
 and should attribute more Fidelity and Perfecti-
 on to him than to Holy Scripture, I am of Opi-
 nion, that no Man in his Wits will therein be his
 Follower. Moreover as to the Story of *Esther*,
Josephus in the Place above cited relates Things
 which are neither in the *Hebrew* Copy, nor in
 those Supplements. For Instance, when ^g *Aba-
 suerus* is said to have caus'd some Things to be
 read to him out of the Records, here *Josephus*
 adds, that the King understood that one whose
 Name was recorded, had been presented with a
 considerable Estate in the Country, for his great
 Services; that another for his Fidelity had been
 honour'd with Gifts of a very great Value: Then,

* Antiq. l. i. c. 3. ^e Lib. 50. cap. 8. 2 Sam. xiv. 26.
^f Esther vi. 1.

what immediately follows, the King from the Records, coming to know what Things *Mordecai* had done, he ask'd, what Hour of the Night it was? And hearing that it was about the Break of Day, then he commanded them to go and see what Man of the King's Friends was at the Gate of the Palace. It is much of the same Stamp, what he writes, when, by the King's Order, *Haman* commanded *Mordecai* to lay aside his Sackcloth, and to be cloathed with Purple; *Mordecai*, thinking that he mocked him, said, *Thou wicked Wretch dost thou thus insult over our Calamity?* Again, that one of Queen *Esther's* Eunuchs who was sent to invite *Haman* to Supper, seeing the Gallows set up in his House which was prepar'd for *Mordecai*, ask'd one of the Servants for what End it was set up? Which Things with others of like Nature, since he neither took them from the *Hebrew* Copy, nor from these *Greek* and *Latin* Supplements, most probable it is that he feign'd out of his own Brain. Therefore the Saying of *Jerom* deserves our Approbation, who in his Preface on the Book of *Esther* ^h says, " That the divine Book of *Esther* " was vitiated by many Translators: Which I " producing from the Archives of the *Hebrews*, " have translated more accurately Word for " Word. Which Book the vulgar Edition interlaces here and there with additional In- " tions; adding such Things as might have been " spoken or heard upon the Occasion: As is " customary in School Exercises to take a Theme, " and to invent what might be said by him who " hath suffer'd, or hath done an Injury."

Fourthly, Nor should we neglect to observe, that the *Greek* Version of *Esther* is not consistent

^h Tom. 4. opp. f. 9.

even with itself, much less with the *Hebrew Text*. The very learned *James Usher* at the End of his Treatise upon the *Septuagint* Translation, hath annexed two *Greek* Copies of the whole Book (together with its Additions here and there inserted) borrow'd from the Manuscript Copy of the *Arun-del Library*: One of which, of the Edition of *Origen*, marks with *Asterisks* those Places which were found in the *Hebrew Text*, but omitted by the *Septuagint*, and it marks with *Obelisks* what Things were added to the true *Hebrew Text*: The other is much shorter, but ancient also. Mr. *Whiston* should first reconcile those Contrarieties, and should make good the Authority of the *Greek Esther* (which he himself questions, as to *Mordecai's Dream*, and the Manner of the Conspiracy against *Abasuerus*, and the Letter for observing the Feast of *Purim*) before he attempts by the pretended Authority of that Book, to charge the true *Hebrew* Copy with Corruptions and Omissions.

Fifthly, Among us *Gerhard* ⁱ is as copious as any in assigning Reasons, why we exclude those spurious Supplements from the holy Canon. Whose Observations we shall not repeat here, intending Brevity, nor add any Thing of our own to them, since our Adversary does not push that Point further.

OBJ. VII. Page 56. " He appeals next to " the Appendix of the Book of *Job*, which " tho' wanting in the *Hebrew Text*, yet is read " in the LXX. And in the first Century is " quoted in the Apostolical Constitutions^k: And " that it was in the *Hebrew Text* about the Time " of *Origen*, appears by his Epistle to *Africanus*.

ⁱ Exeg loci 1. de Script. S. Sect. 198, &c. cap. 7.

^k Lib. 5.

ANSW. There is no kind of Addition however spurious, or of slender Credit, if it is to be found among the *Greeks*, but Mr. *Whiston* will drag it in to serve his Purpose, and to impeach the Integrity of the *Hebrew Code*. But if he produces no better Arguments than these, he will never carry his Point with any pious and learned Man. For if in the first Ages of Christianity, even to the Time of *Origen*, that additional Paragraph was read in the *Hebrew*, how comes it to pass, that neither *Aquila* nor *Symmachus* (both of them much older than *Origen*) when they translated the *Hebrew* into *Greek*, knew nothing of it, as the *Greek Catena* of *Nicetas* upon *Job* testifies? This *Catena* certifies that all that Appendix was taken out of a *Syriack Book*. And although the *Scholion* (p. 612.) says that the *Hebrew Tongue* was meant by the *Syriack*, which if true, this Verse must have been turn'd into *Greek* from the *Hebrew Code*, (which according to Custom might have been call'd the *Syriack*) yet that this is asserted without any Foundation is manifest, because that Appendix is not to be found in the *Chaldee Paraphrase*, which yet represented the whole *Hebrew Copy*. Wherefore we must here strictly insist upon the Letter, and believe that the *Catena* speaks of the old *Syriack Version*, to which the ancient Writers do often refer, for which ¹ *Andreas Mullerus Greiffenbagius* hath collected some Fragments. Nor do the Arguments produc'd by our Adversary prove any Thing more. He insists, *first*, upon the *Septuagint Translation*. But since we have already prov'd by most pregnant Arguments, that the *Greek Version*, which now passes under that Name, is either altogether different from the old one of the LXX

Elders, or that it is strangely interpolated and vitiated, that Conclusion certainly which is drawn either from our *Greek Copies*, or the *Greek Copies* of the Fathers, is a very weak one, as to proving that the LXX Elders translated not otherwise, or read not otherwise in the *Hebrew Copy*, than is now read in the *Greek*. He appeals, *secondly*, to the *Apostolical Constitutions*. Indeed our Adversary upon other Occasions, defends the Integrity of those Constitutions with all his Might; but if the Arguments which *Gerh.^m* and *Rivetusⁿ*, and most copiously *Job. Dallæus* have advanc'd against their Authority, from the very Body of the Constitutions themselves, no Man will readily think them to be of an Apostolick Original^p, or that they were known in the first Century: But we are not upon that Controversy now. Finally, he pretends that *Origen* quoted it. He does so, but withal confesseth that the Verse is not in the *Hebrew Copy*, contrary to what *Mr. Whiston* gives out. These are his Words, which are read thus in his Epistle to *q Africanus*: “but likewise in *Job* “from that Place; but it is written that he [*Job*] “shall rise again with them whom the Lord raises “up, even to the end; it is not in the *Hebrew*, “and therefore not in *Aquila*. But in the *Sep-* “tuagint and *Theodotion* they are found, or much “to the same Purpose”. Hence it is that it never appear'd in the *Hexapla* of *Origen*: Not to mention that in the Age of *Origen*, many

^m Gerh. Conf. Cath. lib. 1. pag. 2. cap. 7. ⁿ Crit. S. lib. 1. cap. 2. ^o De Pseud. Epigraphis Apostolicis, lib. 1.

& 2. ^p Note, That *Mr. Turner* of Colchester has particularly and fully confuted *Mr. Whiston's Pretences* in favour of the *Apostolical Constitutions*, in a Book intitled, A Discourse of the pretended Apostolical Constitutions. London 1715.

MOSES MARCUS.

^q Sub finem Operum a Gilberto Genebrardo, Par. 1619. editorum, pag. 59.

falsely

falsely so nam'd propheticall and apostolicall Writings were forg'd and dispers'd, some of which although, by the Use made of them among the Learned, they obtained some Degree of Authority, yet they were never equally esteem'd with the canonical and divine Scripture. You may consult for this my * *Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament*, where we have disputed largely and professedly against *Jacob Bonfrerius*, who maintains the Canonical Authority of this Appendix: As to the *Greek Appendix* itself, taken from the *Greek Catena*, you may read it with the Exposition of *Olympiodorus*, in the Book of * *Joh. Albertus Fabricius*.

OBJ. VIII. Page 57. " He appeals to Dan. x. 20. where the Angel refers him to an authentic Testimony of Scripture, which is not to be seen now, whence it appears by Testimony of an Angel, that in ancient Times there was a famous Text read in the Copy of the Old Testament, which is wanting in all our present Copies. "

ANSW. One might imagine Mr. *Whiston* to be a Pensioner of the Papists, while he takes so much Pains to impeach the Integrity of sacred Writ, as even to exceed their Calumnies. For I don't at present remember any Romish Commentator upon Scripture, who upon this Place hath suspected any such Omission, or hath charged the Book of *Daniel* with Deficiency. But upon what Grounds he is so charged, shall be known presently. The *Hebrew Words* of the Text runs thus: אבל אגיד לך את הרשום בבחב אמת But I will shew thee that which is noted in the Scripture of Truth: In which Words the Decree of divine

* Introd. ad Lib. Vet. Test. pag. 2. cap. 2. S. 14. p. 69, &c.
* Cod. Pseudepl. Vet. Test. p. 1. c. 145. p. 793, &c.

Providence, taken from the secret Counsels of Heaven, and which was to be reveal'd and made known to *Daniel* by Command of God, is by the Angel said to be *noted* and sign'd in the *Scripture of Truth*. * *Johan. Svaningius*, a most learned *Danish* Commentator, explains this Place soundly and clearly, whose Words we think proper to write down. Thus he says, " by כתב אמת *Katab Amat*, the *Scripture of Truth*, is understood in this Place, the Decree of the divine Will concerning the various Changes of the *Jewish* Affairs, to which the Event should exactly answer: Here is a Metaphor fetch'd from the Custom of Kings, whose Commands have then their Authority and Force, when they are noted down, as we read *Ezth.* viii. 8, 13. so that the Sense is: What Things I am to declare about the future Event of the *Jewish* Affairs, are so conformable to Truth, that Faith can no more be denied to them than to the publick Decrees of Kings, which, when once consign'd to Writing, use to remove all suspicion of Doubt from the Minds of the Subjects." And a little after he adds: " But this Prediction of the heavenly Angel is called כתב אמת *Katab Amat*, the *Scripture of Truth*, or the true *Scripture*, because nothing fabulous, nothing of idle Tales can here be found written, but a most certain and undoubted History is here related." Our ^u *Geierus* is herewith of the same Mind comparing *ch.* v. 24, 25. and *ch.* vi. 9. with this. Nor are those of the Church of *Rome* of different Sentiments; particularly *Gaspar Sanctius* writes thus: " The *Scripture* here means a Decree, which Name is therefore impos'd upon Decrees and Resolu-

* Suo in h: l. Comment.

^u Cap. 5, 24, 25. & cap. 6, 9.
tions;

" tions; because *Decrees* that they may be rati-
 " fied, and People ascertain'd of their Faith and
 " Verity, are commonly committed to writing.
 " Hence among the *Greeks* *γραφω*, which in
 " strictness signifies writing, yet frequently sig-
 " nifies to *decree*, or to enact. Therefore the
 " *Scripture of Truth* is the same as a *true Decree*.
 " * *Cornelius a Lapide* explains the *Scripture of*
 " *Truth* of the Book of divine Prescience and
 " Predestination, which is most true, certain, and
 " infallible." *Maldonatus*, *Emanuel Sa*, *Johan-*
nes Menochius, and *Jacobus Tirinus* take it in the
 same Sense. No Body therefore hath been so
 quick-sighted as Mr. *Whiston*, who could see the
 Angel referring to a Portion of Scripture which
 hath been lost; because no Man hath attempted so
 freely to bespatter the Holy Scripture as he has
 done. But if he can make good his Assertion,
 let him shew us from what Place this Prediction
 of the heavenly Messenger hath been dropp'd,
 and to what Book of the Old Testament it is to
 be restored. For the Matters which he [the
 Angel] speaks of, can have no Place where they
 may properly come in, the whole Scripture be-
 ing silent upon the Subject. Nor indeed doth
 the Angel promise, that he would explain a Sen-
 tence of a written Book, but that he would reveal
 Things not before heard of, nor known to any
 Mortal, out of the secret *Decrees* of divine Pro-
 vidence. And therefore, the Angel being in
 haste to go to *fight with the Prince of Persia*, yet
 was to employ the short remaining Time he had
 to certify the Prophet concerning such Things
 as without his Notice he could no way have dis-
 covered. Finally, according to *ψ. 12, 14, 20.*

* De libro Præscientiæ & Prædestinationis Dei.

these Hints were given to the Prophet upon his Prayers: But if in former Times they had been written in the Holy Scripture, and expos'd to be read by all Men, there had been no need for an Angel to come down from Heaven to reveal them, neither had there been any occasion for the Prophet to give Thanks to God for his singular Grace in hearing his Prayers. So little Coherence has this Conceit of the *Bible-bater* with the Circumstances of the Text, that being compar'd with this Chapter, it confutes and destroys itself.

OBJ. IX. Page 57. " He pleads that the Prophecy of *Jonas* mention'd 2 *Kings* xiv. 25. is now no where to be found in the Book of this Prophet. Neither is his latter Prophecy against *Nineveh* to be seen in all the Old Testament, and yet the same is spoken of *Tob.* xiv. 4, 8. and *ψ*: 15, said to be fulfilled a little after."

ANSW. It is a commendable Thing it seems with Mr. *Whiston* to borrow Arrows even from *Spinoza's* Quiver, if they can but do him Service against the Scripture; for the same individual Argument you may read in *Spinoza*. But as we freely grant that *Jonas* did deliver such a Prophecy as is referr'd to 2 *Kings* xiv. 25. So that he committed the same to writing, and inserted it by Direction of the Spirit into the Canon of Faith, we shall not be persuaded, until he proves the same by solid Arguments. For did not the Prophets deliver Prophecies both more in number, and more particularly and largely express'd, than they ever committed to writing? And who can deny that *Jonas*, who was a Prophet of the Kingdom of *Israel*, chiefly discharg'd his Function in

1 *Μισοβίβλ.*

2 *Tr. Theol. Pol. cap. 10. pag. 130.*

his native Countrey, and often preach'd to his Countrey-men, tho' we read not of his leaving any Thing thereof in writing. Neither indeed did ever the Holy Ghost intend or provide, that all the Oracles and divinely inspir'd Discourses of the Prophets should be inserted in the *Canon*, but only those of them which should be for the constant Use and Direction of the Church, 2 *Tim.* iii. 16. But the bare mentioning of this Prophecy 2 *Kings* xiv. no more proves that it was read in the written Canon, than the Apostle *Jude's* making mention of the Prophecy of *Enoch* proves the like of it. Whence it is, that the sacred Text refers only רבר יהוה אלהי ישראל אשר רבר בידו רבר יונה בן אמית הנביא *The Word of the Lord God of Israel which he spoke by his Servant Jonas, the Son of Amithai the Prophet, &c.* But refers not at all to any canonical Scripture. And therefore it is altogether vain, to alledge that a Text has been lost out of the sacred *Code*, when no Man can demonstrate that it ever was there. This might also be a sufficient Answer to the Testimony of *Tobias*, if that Apocryphal Book were of such Authority, as to meet with any Credit among the more intelligent Part of Mankind. But since ^a *Jo. Rainoldus* shrewdly judges that it is full of egregious Lies, and that ^b the Author of that Book *spoke like a Poet*, who in an invented Speech of his own highly magnified the Patience and Piety of *Tobias*, but forgetful of his own Rules, deceiv'd himself in the Circumstances; it is incumbent upon Mr. *Whiston* to make good his Testimony, before he sets it up in Opposition to the Perfection of the Scripture, so well supported by many and solid Reasons.

^a In Censura lib. Apocr. Præl. 45. seq. pag. 458, &c.

^b Præl. 65. pag. 728.

OBJ. X. Page 58. " He farther pleads *Gen.*
 " ii. 2. which Place discovers a manifest Corrup-
 " tion, for it says, that *God finish'd all his Works*
 " *upon the seventh Day*, although it is clear from
 " *Gen. i. 31.* that he ended them upon the sixth
 " Day. The true Reading therefore, which
 " substitutes the sixth in Place of the seventh,
 " still remains in the *Samaritan Copy*, in the *Sy-*
 " *riack Version*, in the *Greek Septuagint*, in *c Phi-*
 " *lo*, in *d Irenæus*, and perhaps it is also insinua-
 " ted in the Epistle of *c Barnabas*, as it is no
 " way likely that he should dissent from the
 " *Greek Version.*"

ANSW. This Charge also is borrow'd from *Cap-*
pellus, whose Quirks and Quibbles *f Buxtorf* hath
 refuted: And *g R. Menasseh ben Israel* hath epitomiz'd the *Jewish* Expositions upon the Place, many of which are indeed far fetch'd, but the Exposition which has been most commended and assented to by the Christians, is that which renders the Verb וַיַּעַחַל *Vayechal*, in the preterpluperfect Tense: *For on the seventh Day, God had ended the Work, which he had made, i. e.* when he had compleated his Work, he rested and ceas'd upon the self-same seventh Day, from creating all his Works. So *Calovius* amongst us Lutherans; and of the Reformed, *Janus Drusius*, *Sixtinus Amama*, *Job. Henr. Hottingerus*, *Jo. Buxtorfius*; of the latest popish Interpreters, *h Bernb. de Montfaucon*, and innumerable others: Although *i Claudius Frassenius* rather chose to place the compleating of all the Works of God in blessing and sanctifying the seventh Day; and *k Jo. Mar-*

c Allegor. i. p. 41. *d* Lib. 5. cap. 28. pag. 444, &c.
e Sect. 15. *f* Anticr. Part II. cap. 7. pag. 539, &c. *g* In
 Conciliatore. qu. 13. ad Gen. pag. 21. *h* In Hexapl.
 Orig. not. ad h. l. *i* Disqu. Bibl. in Gen. quæst. i. in cap. 2.
 pag. 52. *k* In methodo Sacra expl. Script. per seipsam, p. 33.

tineus places it in the Rest it self, which was in a Manner the Conclusion of the whole Work of the Creation. But as the Consummation of the Creatures, of which it is here spoken, implies that the Creation and Production of Things was compleated, from which Propriety of Speech the two worthy Men last named without any Necessity dissent; so he who had compleated his Work upon the seventh Day, by putting the last Hand to it, and giving it the finishing Stroke, must be suppos'd to have done something upon the seventh Day, and not to have altogether rested and ceas'd from his whole Work, which is contrary to *Exod. xx. 11. Heb. iv. 4.* and even to the History of the Creation. Therefore even ¹ *Jerom* himself concludes that God did work upon the Sabbath, by compleating his Works upon it. For solving this Difficulty, ^m *Aben Ezra* furnishes us with an excellent Observation, to which he first premises a Canon, that כלוי מעשה איתנו מעשה: *the finishing or ending of a Work does not belong to the Work itself:* Which ⁿ *Nizzachon Vetus* thus explains כי בו שבת שהרי סיים מלאכתו ביום הששי ולא היה לו לעשות מאומה כי כלה וסיים ביום הששי ושבת ביום השביעי By these Words; *Because he rested upon the seventh Day, is meant that he had already compleated his Work upon the sixth Day; and that there was nothing remaining for him to do, because he had finished and compleated all Things upon the sixth Day, and so he rested upon the seventh.* From this we may understand that mention is made of the seventh Day in the Creation of the World, not inclusively, but terminatively only; which also *Bonsfrerius, Menochius* and other good Expositors of the Holy Scripture approve of, thence concluding that the

¹ De Tradition. Hebr.

^m Comment. ad Exod. xii. 16.

ⁿ In Wangenfeli telis igneis. Sat. pag. 9.

beginning of the seventh Day, was the end of the sixth Day, in which God had finished the Works of the Creation. Again *Aben Ezra* before mentioned, bids us observe upon the Word ביום *Bayom*, that the prefix'd ב signifies the same Thing with שרם *Taram*, before; so that the Sense may be, *God had finished his Work which he had made before the seventh Day, therefore he rested, &c.* And that in this, you may not think him to recede from the Genius of the Language, or the Usage of the Scripture, he instances in many like Places of Scripture, in which the Thing itself shews us the Signification of the Particle ב *Exod. xii. 15. Seven Days eat ye unleavened Bread* אך ביום הראשון חשביתו שאר מבתים *but upon the first Day it self, then you must put away the old Leaven out of your houses:* that is to say, שרם היום הראשון *before the first Day, ye shall make it to cease, or put it away, &c.* And *Deut. xxv. 4. ברישו in treading,* or as *Junius* hath marked it on the Margin, *Hebr. in tritura ejus, while it is treading,* which is to be explain'd שרם רישו *before the treading,* For the Mouth of the Ox must be muzzled, not in the Act while he is treading, but before he begins to tread out the Corn. The very industrious *Christoph. Noldius*, who with these others whom we have mention'd, hath given us more Examples of this Signification of the Particle ב פ, he explains this

• In Concord. Partic. pag. 144. & in Annotat. n. 1007. p. 940, &c.

פ It may here be added for farther Illustration, that even the English Particle *By* (from the Saxon *be*, from the Hebrew ב) is at this Day still used in the like Sense. As when we say by such a Time, by four a Clock, by Christmas, and the like, it means the same as before. And therefore if *Gen. ii. 2* were rendred, by the seventh Day God ended his Work, such rendring would exactly answer what *Aben Ezra* and the rest of the Jewish Criticks mean, and would perfectly well suit both with the English and the Hebrew Idiom. MOSES MARCUS.

very Place, of which we are treating, with *Fagius* and *Vatablus* by קדם *Kadam*, before the seventh Day. I see that the very learned ⁹ *Thom. Crenius* hath observed the same. When Matters stand thus, it is out of doubt whether the authentick Text, which reads the seventh Day, or the Translations which puts the sixth in its Room, are in an Error. It is evident, that its Sense is commodious, and that its Reading is the same in all the Copies which are extant at this Day: But the Versions being vitiated by the Fault of Translators, who did not understand the Meaning of *Moses*, ought not to be pleaded to discredit the Original. The *Septuagint* therefore is wrong, ἡ σὺνέλεσεν ὁ Θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑκτῇ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ, κ. τ. λ. And God in the sixth Day finished his Works. The *Talmudists* with the most ancient *Jews* reckon this Place among the *thirteen*^r, which they say were industriously and of purpose changed by the *Greek* Translators in their Version, lest the Infidels into whose Language the Law was passing, might be offended, and when they read that God had finished his Work upon the seventh Day, they might say or think, that he was still taken up in the Work of Creation upon that Day: *R. Menasseh ben Israel* whom we quoted before, certifies this. Neither do we regard the *Samaritan* Copy, which when it was corrected by the *Greek*, receiv'd the same Error from it, as is above observed. For the same Reason we are not mov'd with the Authority either of *Philo*, or *Irenæus* who followed the *Greek Bible*. But our Adversary is beside the Truth in boasting that he has the Consent of *Earnabas*; for that

⁹ Exercit. S. in priora quædam *Mosis*, pag. 21, &c.

^r Those thirteen Articles may be seen distinctly recited either in the *Talmud*: *Megilla*, chap. 1. f. 9. Or in our Author *Crit. Sacra*, p. 519. or in *Leusden's Philolog. Hebr. Mixt.* p. 25.

MOSES MARCUS.

Place of the Epistle of *Barnabas* which he quotes, expressly reads: ἡ συνετέλεσεν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐβδόμῃ, ἡ κατέπαυσεν ἐν αὐτῇ, ἡ ἡγάσεν αὐτήν. *And he ended on the seventh Day, and he rested in it, and he sanctify'd it.* Upon which Words *Cotelerius* observes, that perhaps some Copies of the *Greek* Edition did in former Times agree with the *Hebrew*, and for ἐκτῇ on the Sixth, read τῇ ἐβδόμῃ on the Seventh; and he confirms his Conjecture from the fifty first of those *Questions* ascrib'd to *Athanasius*; which Question runs thus: διὰ τί ἡ τῇ ἐβδόμῃ ἡμέρᾳ ὁ Θεὸς ἡλίσιν ἐτέλεσεν; *Why did God end his Creation on the seventh Day?* There is no doubt, but the Place of *Moses*, which we have been discussing, being read in some *Greek* Copy that answer'd to the *Hebrew*, gave occasion to that Question of his. From this it appears, that Mr. *Whiston* was not very considerate in appealing to the Reading of *Barnabas*, who rather proves, that in this particular the *Greek* Text agreed exactly with the *Hebrew* in the first Century.

OBJ. XI. Page 60. He appeals to *Gen. iv. 8.* where it is read: *And Cain said to Abel his Brother.* " Here a Blank is left, for there is no Account in the following Words, what Cain said to *Abel*. But the *Samaritan Pentateuch*, the *Septuagint*, the *Targum of Jonathan*, the ancient *Syriack* Version, and the vulgar *Latin* have supply'd that Defect, by adding thereto; διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πεδῖον, *let us go into the Field*, which exactly agrees to the following Words, as the Text goes on: *And when they were in the Field, Cain rose up against his Brother Abel, and slew him.* The same Words are also confirm'd by the Approbation and Consent of Philo, of *Clemens Rom.* and *Tertullian*.

* Lib. quod deter. insidiat. potiori, p. 155. * Ep. i. S. 4.
 " Adversus Judæos Sect. 5.

“ This is such an absurd Omission, that our mo-
 “ dern Translators, to conceal it from the Vul-
 “ gar, have taken the Freedom to turn it, *And*
 “ *Cain* talked with *Abel his Brother*. Yea the *Jews*
 “ own Copies themselves confess it, leaving a
 “ Blank for the preceding Words. And the
 “ *Masoreth* in their Annotations upon this Place
 “ confess, that there are twenty-eight such im-
 “ perfect and mutilated Verses in the Old Testa-
 “ ment, of which they have never given us a
 “ full Catalogue.

ANSW. Mr. *Whiston* is not the first who hath
 thrown this grievous Aspersions upon the *Hebrew*
 Text, but long before him * *Lud. Cappellus* cri-
 ticized this very Passage, therein obliging the
 Papists, who with † *Cornelius a Lapide*, *Jacobus*
Bonfrerius, and many other Interpreters, have
 found fault with the same. To whom we shall
 give a short Answer,

First, By inquiring into the Sense and Perfe-
 ction of the Text: next, by examining into that
 Addition, and what weight it ought to have.
First, the Verb אמר *Omar*, may either be transla-
 ted, *he said*, referring to some antecedent Sub-
 ject of Discourse, or it may be taken indefinitely,
he talk'd, as not referring to the Things
 spoken, and in this Respect it is of equal Impor-
 tance with the Verb דבר *Dobar*, *to say*: Which e-
 ver way you take it, the Text will stand intire
 without any such Addition. If you chuse the first
 Way, the Contents of *Cain's* Discourse with *A-*
bel, may be understood from the Context in the
 immediately preceding Account, which it was
 needless to repeat, as having been already reci-
 ted. So *Aben Ezra* has it: הקרוב אלי שאמר לו כל
 התוכחות שהוכיחו השם *I am of Opinion, that he told*

* Crit. Sacra lib. 4. Cap. 14. p. 292. † Comment. h. 1.
 him

him all that God had said to him in the Way of Re-
proof. Of the same Mind is ^z R. Jacob Abendana.
Our Countryman Gesner thinks that the Verb
וַיֹּמַר *Vayomar* has a Respect to the preceding
Discourse, as if *Moses* had said, *And Cain told this*
to Abel his Brother: which ^a Theod. Hackspan
proves more fully, who thinks וַיֹּמַר *Omar*, to be
the same with הִגִּיד *Heged*, [indicavit, retulit verba]
he told or related Words. And this he illustrates
from the New Testament, where it is said, Joh.
xviii. 16. *But Peter stood at the Door without, Then*
went out that other Disciple, καὶ ἔπερ τῆ θυρωρῶν, and
spake unto her that stood at the Door, and brought
in Peter: But what did he speak? nothing which
follows; but he *told* that which was mention'd a
little before, viz. *that Peter stood at the Door*.
And that Explication of the Word so well pleas'd
Jacob Schmidius, a most excellent Commentator
upon Scripture, that he thus translated the Text
in the Latin Version; *Dixit quidem (hoc) Cainus*
ad Habel fratrem suum. Nihilominus tamen factum
est, quum essent in agro, ut surgeret Cainus, &c.
Cain indeed told (this) to Abel his Brother; yet ne-
vertheless it came to pass, when they were in the
Field, that Cain arose, &c. Among the reformed,
^b *Jo. Heideggerus* is of the same Mind. But if you
had rather take the other Construction, the Text
plainly requires no preceding Subject of Discourse
at all, but it will stand thus: *And Cain talked*
with his Brother Abel: Or as *Tremellius* and *Ju-*
nius render it, *post colloquebatur Cajin cum Hebe*
fratre suo; afterwards Cain talk'd with Abel his
Brother. And that (as they explain by a Note
to it) *dissembling his Hatred and Envy, that he*

^z In Spicileg. ad Michlol Jophi h. l. ^a Ad Lipmanni
Nizzachon cap. 3. §. 10. p. 409. nec non Notis Phil. Theol.
ad h. l. p. 113. &c. ^b In Hist. Patriarch. p. 1. Exer-
cit. 5. §. 31. p. 191.

might set upon him unawares. For before bearing him the keenest Hatred, he would not so much as speak to him at all; but now that under Colour of Brotherly Love, as *Epiphanius* expresses it, he might take him unawares, he conceal'd his hatred, and began again to be familiar with him. ^c *Megalander Lutherus* thus illustrates the Matter, and after him, ^d *Erasmus Marbachius*, ^e *Glassius*, ^f *Calovius*, ^g *Waltherus*, ^h *Pfeifferus*. But *Pol. Lyserus* most handsomly illustrates the Thing ⁱ thus; *Cain talk'd with Abel his Brother*, i. e. " he laid aside his rough Countenance, and shew-
 " ed no outward Marks of an intraged Mind,
 " but to Appearance he behav'd himself as a
 " Brother; so that both the Parents, and *Abel*
 " himself, became more secure and unguarded.
 " For before this, *Adam* had guarded *Abel*, as it
 " afterwards appears from *Cain's* Answer: For
 " his Parents were afraid, lest *Cain* intended to
 " do him a Mischief. But now *Cain* conversing
 " with his Brother again, they imagin'd all was
 " safe and out of danger: Therefore his Parents
 " thought that it was no longer necessary to
 " have a watchful Eye over *Abel*: *Abel* moreover
 " walks out into the Field alone, promising to
 " himself all imaginable Kindness from his Bro-
 " ther." In this Opinion I acquiesce, because it is more simple than the former, and altogether consonant to the Genius of the holy Language, in which the Verb *אמר* *Omar* is often taken indefinitely, and without citing the Words spoken. So it is, *Exod. xix. 15.* *And Moses went down to the People*, *ויאמר אליהם* *Vayomar Alehem*, and he talk'd with him, where what he talked is not ad-

^c Com. in Gen. fol. 66.

^d Com. in h. l. p. 55.

^e Phil. S. l. r. Tr. i. p. 46.

^f Com. in h. l. ^g Harm.

Bibl. h. l. p. 87.

^h Dub. Vex. h. l.

ⁱ In hoc l.

Gen. p. 392.

ded. Compare *Pf.* iv. 5. and cxxxix. 20. and in this View the Account of *Moses* hangs well together, without any Blank at all ; neither has our Adversary in reality any thing more to object, but that the Translation is not to his Taste.

In the mean Time, *Secondly*, To support this Addition, he advances diverse Considerations.

First, the reading of the *Samaritan Pentateuch*. ^k *Morinus* before him with great Zeal pleaded the same; but ^l *Hottinger* return'd him a solid and particular Answer. For whether this Addition were transferr'd from the *Samaritan* Copy into the *Greek* Version, or from the *Greek* into the *Samaritan*, certainly it was the Production of some Half-Critick, who not perceiving the meaning of the Text, but suspecting an Omission, and being willing to try how he could fill it up, he contriv'd those Words for *Cain* from the following Context, which being at first plac'd upon the Margin, afterwards crept into the Text itself.

Secondly, The like Account will serve for the *Greek* Version, ascrib'd to the *LXX* Elders; for ^m *Origen* hath told us long ago, the Cause from whence theirs proceeded. These are his Words: *Ἐν τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ τὸ λεχθὲν ὑπὸ τῶν Καλὶν πρὸς τὸ Ἀβελ ἔγγεγραπτόν· καὶ οἱ πατέρες Ἀκύλαν ἔδειξαν, ὅτι ἐν τῷ ἀποκρυφῷ φασὶν οἱ Ἑβραῖοι καὶ εἶναι τὸ ἐνλαῶθα καὶ τὸ οὐκ εἶναι ἐνδοκίμῳ.* “ In the *Hebrew*, this saying of *Cain* to *Abel* is not to be found written; yet *Aquila* has it: Because the *Hebrews* say, that it is extant in their Apocrypha [in מִשְׁנָתָם in their *Midraschim*, that is, their mystical and allegorical Interpretations of their Doctors] as it is extant also in the *LXX*. ” By this Discovery it is

^k Exercit. Samar. 3. p. 219. & in Præf. ad Bibl. Græc. S. 7.

^l Exercit. Antimor. S. 59. p. 75, &c.

^m In Scholio, quod ad h. locum in Hexaplis Origenis Bernh. de Montfaucon integrum exhibuit.

clear,

clear, that these Words are no Fragment of the Text, but a Gloss put upon it by the ancient *Rabbies*; to which agrees St.ⁿ *Jerom*, who thus explains the Place: “ *And Cain said to Abel his Brother*; here we are to understand what things the Lord had spoke to him. Therefore, what is found in the *Samaritan* and our Volume is superfluous: *Let us go into the Field.*”

Therefore, *Thirdly*, Neither the *Syriack*, nor the vulgar *Latin* can give any Authority to this Interpolation, which the *Glossa Ordinaria*, *Carthusianus*, *Nic. Lyranus*, and *° Sixtus Senensis* ingeniously confess not to belong to the Text, and that it is nothing but a foreign Supplement foisted into the Scripture.

Fourthly, I cannot but admire, with what Face Mr. *Whiston* can bring upon the Stage the *Jerusalem Targum*, and the false *Targum* of *Jonathan*, as Evidences against the Perfection of the Scripture: For they are both of too late a Date, and too romantick in their way of Writing, to be set in Competition with the *Hebrew* Text; much less should they be allow'd to pass Sentence against it. And why don't he complain, that the prolix Dialogue between *Cain* and *Abel*, inserted in this very Place by both those Paraphrasts, hath slipp'd out of the *Hebrew* Copy, and should be restored upon the Faith of the *Cbaldaick* Paraphrase? The Targumists themselves would not take upon them to persuade their Readers, that that Dialogue was of divine Original and Inspiration, but they intended only to illustrate the Text, and to let the World see what *Cain* might have spoken, not what he actually did speak. The Words which we are now treating of, are of no more

ⁿ Quæst. five Trad. Hebr. in Genes. T. 4. f. 92. ° Bibl. S. lib. 5. Annot. 66.

Authority than that Dialogue. But from the Paraphrase of *Onkelos*, which is expressed exactly according to the *Hebrew* Copy, and makes no Mention of this Passage, we conclude more justly, that before *Christ's* Time it was not, and by consequence, that it never was in the *Hebrew* Copy.

Fifthly, If the Authority of *Philo* were of any Value, that would help us as much to enlarge the History with another new Fable. For in the Place cited, he tells us, "How that *Abel* was challenged by *Cain* to a Dispute about Sacrifices and Religion, but *Abel* knowing *Cain* to be a cunning Sophister, and that he himself was but unacquainted with the Arts of Eloquence, did right not to accept the Challenge, but to decline it." The Vanity of this Fiction betrays itself.

Sixthly, We are not in much Pain about *Clemens Rom.* and *Tertullian*, because they could not cite the Place otherwise than they read it in the *Greek* or *Latin* Bibles which they used.

Seventhly, There may be somewhat more of Weight in the *Piska*, [*Pause* or *Blank*] in the *Hebrew* Text, with the *Masoreth's* Mark to it. But *R. Menachim* exempts this Text from those Places noted with a *Piska*, by Authority of *Hillel's* Copy of *Maimonides* and *Meirus*; and you may see it noted upon the Margin of the *Hebrew* Bible printed at *Hall*, that this Verse ought to be written, בלא פסקא *Belo Piska*, without *Piska*, or any Space or Blank left in the Line. But suppose it be of the Number of those Verses which have a *Piska*, as the *Masora* makes it, and many printed Copies also; the Text still remains perfect and intire. For they are in a gross Mistake, who think that a *Piska* notes any Defect, for it rather points out to us, that the Sense is complete באמצע מסוק
Beamtzang

Beamtzang Pazuk, in the Middle of the Verse; and it cautions the Readers and Librarians, lest when the latter Part of the Verse begins a new Sense, they should therewith also begin a new Verse, or suspect that any thing is wanting; for *Piska* denotes a Rest or Pause: and that Space or Blank, which the Scribes leave empty of Words, only requires Men when they are reading, to observe a certain Space, Interval or Pause, in Modulation of their Voice. From all which it appears, that our Adversary hath nothing he can justly find Fault with on this Head.

OBJ. XII. Page 61. " He appeals to the Law
 " of Circumcision, the latter Part of which, *Gen.*
 " xvii. 14. is read in the *Samaritan* and *Greek* Co-
 " pies: *Every Male Child, whose Flesh of his*
 " *Foreskin is not circumcised upon the eighth Day,*
 " *that Soul shall be cut off from among his People:*
 " And so they read it in the Time of *P Justin*,
 " and of *Origen* as the *Philocalia* assures us. But
 " because, according to the Testimony of *Philo*,
 " this Law seem'd too rigid and severe to the
 " *Jews* of his Time, the *Hebrew* Text omitted
 " these Words, *upon the eighth Day*.

ANSW. Mr. *Whiston* borrow'd this Charge, or might have done, from *Paulus Colomesius*, or chiefly from *Paul Pezron*, who judges, that the *Jews* erased out of their Copy in this Place, the mentioning of the *eighth Day*, lest their Children, who happen'd to be uncircumcised, might seem liable to be cut off. For if the eighth Day be cloudy, or if the Wind blows East, they scruple not to defer Circumcision to a clearer Day. But as *Michael Lequien* hath fully answer'd *Pezron*, so the Text itself sufficiently vindicates its own

P Dial. cum Tryphone p. 227. *q* P. 13. *r* Observat. Sacr. p. 64. *s* Antiq. temporum restituta ac Defen. cap. 3. *t* Defensionis Text. Hebr. & vers. vulg. cap. 6.

Perfection: For the 12th Verse of the same Chapter, as also *Lev. xii. 3.* in express Words, appoint the *eighth Day* for Circumcision; from which Places it had also been necessary for the *Jews* to have expunged those Words, if they had intended to elude, or to understand in a larger Sense, the necessary Restriction of Circumcision to the *eighth Day*. There has been indeed much Debate about the Sense and subject Matter of this Verse, whether uncircumcised Infants are absolutely condemn'd, because the Words added in the *Greek Copy*, do determine it ἐν ὀγδόῃ ἡμέρᾳ, upon the *eighth Day*; or whether it is to be understood of adult Persons, who neglect or reject Circumcision. For it seemed hard Measure that Infants should suffer for the Fault of their Parents, or for the Neglect of those whose Business it was, and that to such a Degree, that those poor Innocents should be afflicted with spiritual and eternal Punishment, in being cut off or destroy'd by God, if, without any Fault of theirs, they should so want Circumcision: Which Manner of Procedure, as it is altogether remote from the infinite Mercy of God, so it is refuted by the Example of *Moses*; who having neglected his young Son's Circumcision, the Father incurr'd the divine Displeasure, and not the Son, *Exod. iv. 24, &c.* For obviating which Difficulties, *Cajetan*, and after him *Fr. Junius*, (whom ^u *Ger. Joh. Vossius* follows) come to this, that they rather chuse to make the Word זכר *Zochor*, in this Verse denote an adult Male, that Infants may be exempted. But ^x *Theod. Hackspan* hath deservedly reprov'd them, shewing, that under the Name כל זכר every Male, in this very Chapter בן שמונה ימים a Child of eight Days old is comprehended.

^u Hist. Pelag. l. 2. p. 2. c. 2. ^x In Sylloge Disput. p. 277, &c.
Those

Those therefore judge better who think, that here are understood those Males, born within the *Jewish* Church, who missing of Circumcision on the eighth Day [by whatsoever Chance, or upon whatever Account it were] afterwards, when they come to Age of Discretion still neglect it also, and despise it. Which Sense of the Words, that most sagacious Commentator upon the Scripture, *Sebast. Schmidius* demonstrates with great Accuracy and Solidity. Thus indeed that Addition of the *Greek* Copy, ἐν ὀγδόῃ ἡμέρᾳ, upon the eighth Day, cannot take Place in the Text, which informs us, that Circumcision neglected, not only upon the eighth Day, but in the succeeding Part of a Man's Life, deserved Extermination. Therefore, these Words are advisedly omitted by *Moses*: which Judgment of ours, the harmonious Consent of all Translations, (excepting the *Greek*) with the *Hebrew* Text, fully proves. The LXX Elders thought fit to add those Words, not because they found them in the *Hebrew*, but that they might, as usual, illustrate and explain the Text, by way of Paraphrase. This *Hugo Grotius* himself acknowledges, making this Note upon the Place: "Somebody here has wrongfully inserted in the *Greek* Copy, the Words τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ὀγδόῃ, upon the eighth Day, as *Augustin* often quotes it.

OBJ. XIII. P. 62. "He appeals to *Exod. xii. 40.* "where according to the *Hebrew*, the Children of "Israel are said to have sojourned 430 Years in the "Land of *Egypt*, but ² *Josephus* acquaints us, that "they did not live above one half of the Time "there. The *Samaritan Pentateuch* and *Septuagint* give us the genuine and full reading, which "runs thus, *The sojourning of the Children of Is-*

Tr. de Circumcisione p. 1. p. 178, &c. ² Lib. 2. Ant. c. 6.
"rael,

“ *rael, and of their Fathers, who sojourned in the*
 “ *Land of Canaan, and in the Land of Egypt, was*
 “ *430 Years.* And this Account also answers to
 “ the Truth of the History. As also, the A-
 “ postle himself confirms this reading, who in-
 “ forms us, that the Law was given 430 Years
 “ after the Covenant that was made with *Abra-*
 “ *ham*, upon his coming out of *Haran*.

ANSW. The same Charge has been brought against the *Hebrew* Text by ^a *Lud. Cappellus*, and more at large by ^b *Is. Vossius*, and last of all by ^c *Pezron*, after whom our Objector hath copied. But as the Order of different Generations manifestly requires that we should refer those 430 Years to the whole Sojourning of the Patriarchs, extended from *Abraham's* going from *Ur* or *Haran*, to the Time that his Posterity marched out of *Egypt*, which chronological Accounts we have connected and defended ^d, and have therein reconciled them with *Gen. xv. 13, &c.* and with *Acts vii. 6*: So on the other hand the *Hebrew* Reading is perfectly right, if the Sojourning of the Children of *Israel*, as express'd by *Moses* in *Exodus*, be taken inclusively, as including the Years of the Sojourning of the Patriarchs, because God himself joins *Abraham* and his Posterity in that Promise; *I will give to thee and thy Seed this Land*, *Gen. xiii. 15.* although the Land was not given to *Abraham*, but to his Seed or Posterity: This ^e *R. Salom. Yarchi* rightly observes, and ^f *R. Menasseh ben Israel* inculcates the same. As therefore the Possession of the Posterity is attributed to the Parents, so likewise the Sojourning of the Fathers is assigned to their Children, ac-

^a Crit. S. l. 4. c. 17. S. 11. ^b Chro. S. Cap. 2. p. 3. ^c Citato libro, p. 64, &c. ^d In Introd. ad Lib. Bibl. V. T. p. 1. c. 5. S. 5. p. 89, &c. ^e Ad Exod. xii. 40. ^f In conciliatione quæst. 41. in Gen. S. 1.

cording to the same Latitude of Speech by which the ^f *Israelites* make the Passage through the *Red Sea* common to themselves with their Forefathers, *Pf. lxvi. 6.* Wherefore the *Chaldee*, the *vulgar Latin*, the *Arabick*, and other ancient Paraphrases, and the whole Multitude of *Jewish* Interpreters, follow the *Hebrew* reading. Add to this, that the *Talmudists* reckoning up this Place among those thirteen, which they suppose the *LXX* to have chang'd, or to have render'd with some Variation in their Version, do thereby intimate, that this is an Explanation of the *Greek* Translators, and that That is not the genuine and ancient reading of the *Hebrew* Copy which is read by them and the *Samaritan*. For this being a considerable Difficulty, which ignorant Men might stumble and take offence at, the *LXX* Interpreters, thought it might be of Service to the pious Reader, to throw in a few explanatory Words, and to give some Light to the Doctors, who were to comment upon it; and this was the Occasion whereupon this Gloss crept into the *Samaritan* Text.

OBJ. XIV. *Page 63.* “ He pleads, *Numb. iv. 14.* where a Law being given for the covering and carrying of the sacred Vessels, the *Hebrew* Text erroneously omits the brazen Laver, but the *Samaritan* and *Greek* Copies make a full Recital, having these Words inserted, *They shall take a Cloth of Scarlet, and they shall cover the Laver, and its Base, and put it in a Purple-coloured Cover of Skin, and put it upon the Staves; which Words, without Question, are unjustly omitted in the Hebrew.*

ANSW. Mr. *Whiston* again borrows this from his good Friend & *Cappellus*, who makes use of

the self same Argument. But if this Verse was in the *Hebrew*, why did not *Onkelos*, the *Latin* Interpreter, or others of the Ancients read it? Upon which account we deny that such a Paragraph was ever extant in the *Hebrew* Text, believing rather that the *Greek* Interpreter, out of his own Head, added these Words, that he might give a complete Account of the Vessels of the Tabernacle, which, according to his Judgment, he thought to have been wanting. But *Moses* himself has said enough to prevent our suspecting any such Blank or Omission, when ver. 12. he summarily names אֵת כָּל כְּלֵי all the Vessels of Service, with which the Priests do minister in the Sanctuary; and again, ver. 15. mentions in the general, אֵת כָּל כְּלֵי הַקֹּדֶשׁ all the Vessels of the Sanctuary, that he might not be obliged particularly to recite every one in distinct Order, which would have made his Discourse too prolix. Therefore, without Controversy, the *brazen Laver* is comprehended under the general Name of all the Vessels of the Sanctuary: and we are clearly taught what was the Use of it, although that additional Verse, as indeed in all Justice it should, be excluded from the Context.

OBJ. XV. Page 63. "He pleads *Numb. x. 6.* "where in the Account of the Use of the Silver "Trumpets, the *Hebrew* and *Samaritan* Text "only mention a Signal to have been given to "two Quarters of the Camp of *Israel*, for beginning their March; the *Greek* Version however with *Josephus*, recounts more fully four "Signals to have been given, one to each Camp. "This is a gross Defect, but very easily run in- "to by Transcribers, where all the Branches are "ὁμοιοτέλευτα, or have the same Ending; which "has been one of the commonest Occasions of "such involuntary Omissions of any other what-

“foever. And indeed we have here a plain Sign
 “of an old Omission in this Place, from the
 “Difference there is in the Names of the Quar-
 “ters that were to march, in the *Hebrew* and
 “*Samaritan*; the former naming only the Ea-
 “stern and Southern, the latter only the Eastern
 “and Northern Quarters.

ANSW. Neither is this Mr. *Whiston*'s own Dis-
 covery, having been before observ'd by ^h *Le*
Clerc. But the Holy Ghost did not judge it ne-
 cessary to describe in many Words, a thing which
 was obvious to every body, that every one of
 the Camps about the Tabernacle, should march
 and follow after one another in Order. For after
 that he had plainly told us, that the Camps of
Judab, *Issachar* and *Zebulun*, which pitched to-
 wards the East, in the first Place, and upon the
 South those of *Reuben*, *Simeon* and *Gad*, in the
 second Place, should take up their Baggage,
 move, and begin their march, upon every sound-
 ing of the Trumpet; hence, they might easily
 understand of the rest of the Tribes, that the
 Camps of *Ephraim*, *Benjamin* and *Manasseh*, which
 pitch'd at the Backside of the Tabernacle to-
 wards the West, should in the third Place; and
 finally, that in the last Place, those of *Dan*,
Asher and *Naphtali*, which lay upon the left Side
 of the Tabernacle towards the South, should
 march off, and shut up the Rear. For that Or-
 der of their Camps and Journey was plainly told
 them ch. iv. so that there was no need of re-
 peating the same Thing in this Place. Therefore
 when the LXX insert here: *ἡ σαλπείετε σημασίαν*
τείττω, ἡ ἐξαρχοσιν αἱ παρεμβολαὶ αἱ παρεμβάλλεσσι
πρὸς δάλασσαν, ἡ σαλπείετε σημασίαν τετάρτῳ, ἡ ἐξα-
ρχοσιν αἱ παρεμβολαὶ αἱ παρεμβάλλεσσι πρὸς βορρᾶν,

^h Comm. in h. l.

And

And ye shall sound the third Signal, and the Camps lying towards the Sea shall advance: And ye shall sound the fourth Signal, and the Camps lying towards the North shall advance: This, taken from the Sense and Context of the preceding Verses, they add out of their own Head. For it is a rash Thing to accuse the sacred Text of any Omission in this Place, since it is usual with the LXX Interpreters more to act the Part of Paraphrasts than Translators, whence it is that they have expressed these Things more particularly. The very learned *Jo. de Outrein* joins with us in this Opinion. Besides, *Le Clerc* confesseth, and the Order of the Camps, *Levit. ii.* plainly proves, that in ver. 6. instead of *תִּמְנָה* towards the South, the Samaritan reads *צָפוֹן* towards the North; so far is this Testimony from discovering of any Blank in the Hebrew Text, that it rather clearly demonstrates its Perfection. Furthermore I very much admire, how Mr. *Whiston* came to forget himself so much, as to destroy his own Hypothesis. For *Prop. 6.* he insists upon it, that the Samaritan Pentateuch, as it stands at this Day, is the genuine & individual Text, which Christ and the Apostles made use of: But here he calls it in Question, charges it with Corruption, and attempts to correct and supply it from the Greek Version, which he himself grants to be strangely corrupted and depraved at this Time. At this rate we shall have no genuine and perfect Copy of the Pentateuch at all. But this Bible-Scourger, so he might but throw Dirt upon the Hebrew Text, made no Scruple of letting the Samaritan also come in for its share with the other.

OBJ. XVI. Page 64. "He appeals to Numb. xvi. 31. where *Dathan* and *Abiram*, with their

† De Clāngore Evangelii, diff. 5. p. 93, &c.

“ Accomplices, are said to have been swallowed
 “ up by the *opening of the Earth*, and the 250
 “ Levites, who took part with them to have pe-
 “ rished by Fire; but we have no Account in our
 “ Greek and Hebrew Copies, what became of Ko-
 “ rah, or what kind of Punishment was inflict-
 “ ed upon him. Yet that it was read in the o-
 “ riginal Hebrew Text, the Samaritan Copy and
 “ *Josephus* plainly testify, declaring that he and
 “ his Companions perished by Fire: The same
 “ Circumstance was anciently in the LXX, as
 “ appears from the Evidence of ^k *Clemens Rom.*
 “ ^l *Ignatius*, and ^m *Eusebius*, and the ⁿ Apostoli-
 “ cal Constitutions.

ANSW. *First*, As to the Death of *Korah*, it is
 a doubtful Question, about which the Learned
 are much divided; some affirming, that he was
 consumed by Fire; others, that he was devour'd
 by the Earth: the Reasons on both Sides are brief-
 ly represented and considered by ^o *Herm. Witfius*.
 But as it is the ordinary Custom of Scripture,
 what it passes over in one Place, to determine in
 another, so it is here. For altho' the sixteenth
 Chapter of *Numbers* only tacitly included the
 Death of *Korah*, in the Fate of the rest who were
 consumed with Fire, yet the twenty sixth Chapter
 of *Numbers*, 9 and 10 Verses, expressly declares
 what became of him, removing all Doubt, while
 it runs thus; *This is that Dathan and Abiram*
who were famous in the Congregation, who strove
against Moses and against Aaron in the Company of
Korah, when they strove against the Lord. And the
Earth opened her Mouth וַתִּבֹּלַע אֹתָם וְאֶת קֹרַח and
swallowed them up together with Korah, when that
Company died, what Time the Fire devoured two

^k Ep. i. S. 4. ^l Ep. ad Magnes. S. 3. ^m In Pf. liv.
 16. & cv. 17. ⁿ Constit. Apost. l. 60. c. 1. ^o Mele-
 tem. Leidenf. Diff. 1. in h. l. S. 35, &c. p. 270.

hundred and fifty Men; and they became a Sign. Where *Korab* is expressly join'd in Punishment with *Dathan* and *Abiram*, who were devour'd by the Earth, and distinguished from those who were consumed by Fire. Hence we understand, that although *Korab* was present with those 250 Men, who stood at the Tabernacle of the Lord with their Censers, and were consumed to Ashes, for rashly taking upon themselves the Office of the Priesthood, ver. 16 and 19. yet he afterwards return'd to his own Tent, at which Time *Moses* went to the Tents of *Dathan* and *Abiram*, ver. 25. And then he, with his Tent and all his Substance, being overwhelm'd by the Opening of the Earth, descended alive to the infernal Pits. Therefore the *Samaritan* Copy is so far from being true, that That, as well as *Josephus*, rather contradicts the Scripture.

But *Secondly*, if we were to rely upon the Fidelity of *Josephus*, not only in this controverted Point, but likewise throughout the whole History, very many things should be wanting as well in the *Hebrew* as in the *Samaritan* and *Greek* Text. For, after his Manner, he acts the Rhetorician, and in the third Chapter of the fourth Book of his *Antiquities*, he does not report it in the same Words which he had read in the *Hebrew* Copy, but he endeavours to set it off with diverse Ornaments; and having first enlarg'd *Moses's* Prayer to God, to a very wide Compass, he at length subjoins this Account about the Earthquake: "*Moses* having utter'd these Words with Tears, on a sudden the Earth trembled horribly, and with its Surface moving like unto the Sea agitated with the Wind, terrified all the People: upon this a dreadful Noise breaking out from the Place where the seditious Rebels were, the Ground sinks under them,

“ them, and at once swallows them all up: And
 “ those profane Persons being thus destroy’d,
 “ the gaping of the Earth closed again to such
 “ a Degree of Exactness, that not so much as
 “ the Appearance of the Cleft remain’d. And
 “ this Destruction was the more dismal, for that
 “ no body, no not one of their Relations or
 “ Kindred pitied them, but the whole Multitude
 “ of the People, forgetting their Ties of Blood, ap-
 “ prov’d the Sentence of God with joyful Ac-
 “ clamations, and did not think that they de-
 “ serv’d any mourning, as having been the Plague
 “ and Destruction of their Countrymen.” Which
 last Words do pretty much contradict the *Mo-
 saical* Account in the 34th and 41st Verses, &c.
 Then he adds many Things of his own Inven-
 tion about the Fire being sent out, which the
 35th Verse makes no mention of: Thus he pro-
 ceeds, “ Suddenly a great Fire appear’d, the
 “ like to which was never kindled by Man, ne-
 “ ver seen in any spontaneous Eruptions of the
 “ Earth, nor in the Woods shatter’d and torn
 “ with the scorching Heat of the dry South-
 “ wind, but this was a Fire so blazing and fierce,
 “ that nothing but the Power of God could have
 “ kindled it: By the Force and Vehemence
 “ whereof, these 250 Men, together with *Ko-
 rab*, were so totally consum’d, that no remains
 “ at all of their Carcasses were now to be seen;
 “ *Aaron* only survived unhurt, that it might be
 “ manifest to all, that this Conflagration came
 “ from above.” These Passages I have taken the
 Trouble to write down at full length, that from
 thence it may appear, with what Fidelity *Jose-
 phus* hath followed the Guidance of Scripture,
 and that it was not his Intention barely to ren-
 der the Text, but to set it off with laboured
 Narratives, with rhetorical Flourishes, and ma-

ny pompous Expressions. Therefore, they are very much in the wrong, who attempt to alter or supply the Text from *Josephus*.

Thirdly, No more do the other Testimonies cited by Mr. *Whiston*, prove this Circumstance of the History to have been in the primitive Greek Copy. *Clem. Rom.* says: Ζῆλῳ & Δαλῶν ἡ Ἀθερώμ ζῶντας κατήγαγεν εἰς ᾄδου, Διὰ τὸ σασιᾶσαι αὐτὲς πρὸς τὸν θεοῦ πρόβητα τῷ θεῷ Μωυσίῳ, *Emulation sent Dathan and Abiram down to Hell alive, because they made an Insurrection against Moses the Servant of God.* But he speaks not one Word of *Korab*, much less does he testify that he was slain by Fire. As to *Ignatius's* Epistle to the *Magnesians*, there is only a Version of it now remaining, neither is it of a Piece, but disagreeing with itself; and it is of doubtful Authority; neither is it proved that he was the Author of it: And if it proves any thing, it does not make it clear, that in ancient Times they read it so about the Death of *Korab* in the Greek Copy, but only that the Doctors of his Age might have thought so from the Concern he had with the 250 Men. The two last Considerations affect likewise the *Apostolical Constitutions*, whose Apostolical Original and Authority, our Adversary will never be able to make out to the Satisfaction of any wise Man, or any Man acquainted with sacred Antiquity. Finally, as to *Eusebius's* reading of this Death of *Korab* in the Greek Copy, the Account of Times refutes it: For Mr. *Whiston* pretends, that this Place was mutilated and corrupted, in the Greek and Hebrew Bibles, towards the End of the first Century; but *Eusebius* lived long after, and consequently could have the Use of no other Copies but those which had been long before corrupted, according to Mr. *Whiston*. From this we see that a Romancer hath need of a good Memory.

OBJ. XVII. Page 65. "He pleads, *Deut. x. 6.*
 " where we read both in the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Co-
 " py, that *Aaron* died at *Mosera*. Now this contra-
 " dicts what is told us, *Numb. xx. 22, 29.* and
 " xxxiii. 30, 39. where it is said, he died upon
 " Mount *Hor*, which was their seventh Station af-
 " ter that at *Mosera*. The *Samaritan Pentateuch*
 " exactly supplies this Defect, in which all these
 " different Stations are set down, and the last of
 " them in *Hor*. From this it is evident, that in
 " this Place both the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Copy
 " have a remarkable Defect.

ANSW. This is also one of those Places which
 hath been attacked by *P Cappellus*, whom *Grotius*
 follows; who thinks that this and the next Verse
 were absurdly foisted into the Text by some Er-
 ror of the Librarian, who was unwilling to spoil
 the Sale of his Copy, by blotting out any thing.
 But there is no Occasion for these rash Expedi-
 ents, while there is room left for reconciling the
 Difficulty: There is a twofold apparent Contra-
 diction, when we compare the Relation of *Moses*,
Deut. x. 6. with *Numb. xxxiii. 30, &c.* The first
 about the Journeying of the *Israelites*, the second
 about the Death of *Aaron*. Our Adversary pas-
 sing over the first in Silence, we shall not touch
 upon it; the last we shall easily settle, by pru-
 dently distinguishing,

First, Betwixt the Station at *Moseroth*, *Numb.*
xxxiii. 30. and between *Mosera*, *Deut. x. 6.* as
 Places very far distant and different from one an-
 other, since the confounding of them together
 hath occasioned all the Difficulty: for the twenty
 seventh Station was in *Moseroth*; but *Aaron* died
 in the thirty fourth.

Secondly, We must observe, that Mount *Hor*

was of a very large Circuit, containing many Towns and Places. *Mosera* was one of them, which [¶] *Varenius* thinks to be the Name of the Desert of Mount *Hor*. When the *Israelites* pitched their Camps at *Mosera*, *Aaron* was commanded to go up to the Top of the Hill, and there having put off his Robes to dye.

Thirdly, The Adverb *Shom*, imports the same here with *Oz*, *then*, as it is *Zeph. i. 14. Psal. xiv. 5, &c.* according to this Account, when they were in the Desert of *Mosera*, then *Aaron* died in the Top of Mount *Hor*. Therefore both the Parts are true and just, when it is said, that *Aaron* died upon Mount *Hor*, and at *Mosera*. But as to the first Difficulty before hinted, which is geographical, the Manner how the *Jews* account for it and solve it, may be seen in [¶] *Menasseh ben Israel* and [¶] *Buxtorff*; and the Way that the Christians take in solving it, may be seen in [¶] *Calovius*, [¶] *Waltherus*, and [¶] *Varenius* before cited.

OBJ. XVIII. P. 66. “ He pleads, *Deut. xxxii. 8.*
 “ where, *when God divided the Nations*, he is said
 “ to have set the Bounds of the People, according to
 “ the Number of the Children of Israel; which is
 “ wide of all Reason. But the true Reading re-
 “ mains in the Greek Copy, which runs thus :
 “ *ἔστησεν ὁρα εἰθῶν καὶ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων Θεῶν*, He
 “ set the Bounds of the Nations according to the
 “ Number of the Angels of God. [¶] *Ecclesiasticus* ap-
 “ proves of this Reading, 130 Years before Christ,
 “ and so does ^z *Philo*, and ^a *Clemens Rom.* And
 “ the following Words of the Text require it :

[¶] Decad. Bibl. in *Deut. h. l. p. 54.* [¶] Concil. qu. 15. in
Num. p. 215. [¶] Anti-Crit. p. 2. c. 13. p. 933, &c. [¶] Bibl.
 Illust. [¶] Harm. Bibl. in h. l. [¶] Decad. ad *Num. xxxiii.*
p. 102. [¶] Cap. xvii. 17. ^z De Plant. Noa, p. 222.
[¶] Ep. 1. S. 29.

“ For the Lord’s Portion is his People, and Jacob
 “ is the Lot of his Inheritance. Which Mr. Whi-
 “ ston thus interprets; While God had placed the
 “ other Nations of the Earth, according to the Num-
 “ ber, and under the Care of Angels, or their Chiefs
 “ the Archangels, he reserved the Government of the
 “ Children of Israel, to be administred in his Name,
 “ by his only begotten Son the Messiah; and made the
 “ Israelitish Form of Government a Theocracy. He
 “ supposes this Corruption both in the Hebrew
 “ and Samaritan Copies to have been occasioned
 “ by the unnecessary criticizing of some Libra-
 “ rian, who taking the Words בְּנֵי-אֵל Bene El,
 “ Sons of God, which he read in the Original for
 “ an Abbreviation of the Words בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל Bene Is-
 “ rael, Children of Israel, and putting into the Co-
 “ py these entire Words in Place of the other,
 “ he made out of Sons of God, Children of Is-
 “ rael.

ANSW. First, As to the reading, we rather
 turn it the other way, and defending the authen-
 tick Text, believe that the Author of the Greek
 Version for יִשְׂרָאֵל Israel, read אֵל El; either be-
 cause he could not see the first Letters of the
 Word, perhaps worn out with Age, or because
 the Particle אֵל El, answer’d better to the Sense
 which he had conceiv’d in his Mind. Now when
 in other Places the Angels of God used to be
 called בְּנֵי אֵל Bene El, Job i. 6. and ii. 1. he
 thought that he made the Text more clear by ex-
 pressing, not the Words, but the Sense, naming
 them ἀγγέλους τῶ Θεοῦ, the Angels of God, for υἱοὶ
 τῶ Θεοῦ, the Sons of God; in like Manner as the
 Alexandrian Manuscript, which has οἱ ἄγγελοι τῶ
 Θεοῦ, where the rest of the Copies read it, υἱοὶ τῶ
 Θεοῦ. For, what Bonfrerius conjectures, (that in
 old Time it was written by the LXX, According
 to the Number of the Children of God, as Lyranus
 and

and *Abulensis* read it, but that some other Person, for Exposition sake, writ upon the Margin, ἀγγέλων, of the *Angels*, which in Process of Time crept into the Text) is not very probable to me, because the constant and most ancient reading, both of the different Copies, and of the Fathers, hath it ἀγγέλων, neither can the Word ἡὼν be prov'd by any Authority, either of the Copy, or of any Doctor of the Church. For thus, after *Clemens Rom.* *Dionysius*, named the *Areopagite*, *Origen*, *Chrysostom*, *Epiphanius*, *Justin*, and of the *Latins*, *Novatian*, in his Book of the Trinity (falsely attributed to *Tertullian* ^b) *Ruffinus* of *Aquileia*, ^c *Jerom*, and others read it; so that there remains no doubt, but this was the reading of it in ancient Times. But we absolutely deny that this reading convicts the *Hebrew* Text of an Error, while the universal Consent of all Copies and Translations proves it perfect and entire. In the Word ישראל *Israel*, the *Chaldee*, *Aquila*, *Symmachus*, *Theodotion*, the *Arabick*, *Syriack*, and finally, the *Samaritan* Copy agree, and as to that Word being corrupted, no Sign of it any where appears. The Authority of *Ecclesiasticus* can do us no harm, which Ch. xvii. 17. says thus: Ἐκάσῃ ἐθνεὶ κατέστησεν ἡγούμενον, ἢ μετὰ κυρίῃ Ἰσραὴλ ἐστίν: And he set a President over each Nation, and *Israel* is the Portion of the Lord: Where he does not insinuate that he read either *Angels*, or *Sons of God*; but according to the receiv'd Opinion among the *Jews*, supposes, that a certain Angel was constituted President over each Nation and Province. For the famous ^d *Geierus* evidently shews, that this was an Opinion amongst the *Jews*: ^e *Jambli-*

^b In Exposit. Symboli.

^c Ad Dan. vi. & l. 2. in Mich.

^d In Disput. de Conformit. Judæo-Papistica in l. de Deo, Angelis & homine, cap. 2. f. 10.

^e Opuscula Phil. p. 586,

&c. De Myster. Ægypt. f. 5, c. 25.

ebus also informs us, that the *Egyptians* entertain'd the same Opinions, But since,

Secondly, Our Adversary pleads for the Reasonableness of his Sense, alledging, that it is clear from the *Antithesis* of the next Verse, that the *Angels* must be here understood, we shall in a few Words consider that Matter. If you believe Mr. *Whiston's* Interpretation,

First, According to the Number, shall signify the same with, *under the Care and Tuition*.

Secondly, By *Angels* here must be understood *Archangels*.

Thirdly, You must believe that there are precisely as many Angels, or however Archangels, as there are Nations spread over the Face of the Earth; directly against Scripture, which speaks of many millions of Angels, *Dan. x. 7.* but makes Mention only of one Archangel in the singular Number, *Dan. x. 13. Theff. iv. 16.*

Fourthly, You must believe that a particular Angel, or Archangel, has the Superintendency over every particular People, which is a Jewish Popish Dream; however some of the Fathers, ^f *Ori-gen*, & *Jerom* and others were of that Mind, and pretended to prove it from the corrupted Greek Translation of this Place, tho' the Scripture acknowledges no such thing.

Fifthly, You must suppose that the Privilege belonging to *Israel*, as being *the Portion of God*, and *the Lot of his Inheritance*, could no otherwise be had but in a theocratical Form of Government: Every Body sees how wild and absurd these Suppositions are. The Intent of this Text is, to set forth the divine Goodness towards *Israel*, in settling and determining the Fate, Habitation and Bounds of other People of the Earth,

^f Hom. 11. 20. & 24. in Numeros. & Ad-Mich. vi. 1. with

with a View to the Advantage of that Nation, so ordering the Affairs of the rest of the World, as he foresaw would prove serviceable to them. The Result of all there said is, that immediately upon the Dispersion and Confusion of Tongues at *Babel*, when the Sons of Men were scatter'd over the World, God in a special Manner provided for the Children of *Israel*, appointing distinct Bounds to other People, as he foresaw would prove advantageous to Them, for the signalizing his Care and Providence towards the *Israelites*. The Reason of this divine Beneficence is subjoin'd, Verse 9. *The Portion of the Lord is his People, Jacob is the Lot of his Inheritance.*

OBJ. XIX. Page 68. " He pleads, *Deut. xxxiii.*
 " 6. where in the Blessing of *Moses*, the Tribe
 " of *Simeon* is alone pretermitted, both in the
 " *Hebrew* and *Samaritan* Copies, as also in some
 " Copies of the *Septuagint*. However, since this
 " Blank is supply'd in the *Complutensian* and *Ve-*
 " *netian* Edition, and in the *Alexandrian* Manu-
 " script : *Καὶ Συμεὼν ἔσω πολλὸς ἐν ἀριθμῷ*, *And let*
 " *Simeon be many in Number* : Since all this Pre-
 " diction exactly agrees with the foregoing History
 " as to the great Numbers of this Tribe ; *Numb.*
 " i, ii, iii, it seems very likely that this Tribe was
 " at first put into the Text with the other Tribes,
 " but that afterwards it was dropp'd.

ANSW. The Reading being what the *Hebrew* Copies universally retain, which the *Chaldean* and *Latin* Paraphrasts have expressed, and which is kept in Pope *Sixtus's* Copy of the LXX, (which is certainly more to be trusted than the *Alexandrian*) we shall think it a rash Thing to change it in Favour of the *Alexandrian* Copy, or of the *Complutensian*, or *Venetian* Edition. For when the *Greek* differs from itself in almost innumerable Instances, neither can you be positive what to re-

fer to its original Composure, or what to the Corruptions of Copists, what to the Glosses of Criticks, what to the other *Greek* Translations, and their remarkable Confusion arising from *Origen's* mixing them in his Work; it is certainly absurd to change the pure Reading of the Originals, and of the Paraphrases, and of the truer *Greek* Copies, on account only of the Disagreement of one or two of them. *Bonfrerius* upon the Place says much better: "As to the Name of *Simeon* being inserted in the Royal and *Basilean* Copies, it was foisted in by some officious Person, since neither ^h *Ambrose*, nor ⁱ *Epiphanius*, nor *Theodoret*, nor *Diodorus Tarsensis*, nor *Procopius Gazæus* acknowledge that Addition, therefore it hath been deservedly expunged out of the *Roman* Copies. Neither could the Tribe of *Simeon* pretend to be numerous, because both for the small Lot assigned them, and their Fewness in Number, they were always esteem'd one of the least of the Tribes. The Reason which might move any Man to insert *Simeon's* Name here, might have been, as it seems, because otherwise the Tribe of *Simeon* must be supposed to have been omitted by *Moses*: But better it is to acknowledge that, than to insert any thing against the Faith of all Copies, the *Hebrew*, our Translation, the *Chaldee* Paraphrase, yea, and of the more correct *Septuagint*." But,

Secondly, If in Favour of this Interpolation you alledge, that otherwise we should not have a full Account of the Tribes, for it can scarcely be believed, that *Moses* blessed all the rest of the Tribes, and omitted only that of *Simeon*: Some will answer, that this is no way contrary to the Custom of Scripture, where you may see *Dan* and *Zebulun*

^h In Bened. Patr.

ⁱ In Anchor.

altogether omitted, as in 1 *Chr.* iv. 8. as also in *Rev.* vii. 5, 6, 7. there is no Mention made of *Dan*: Others give for a Reason of this, the Crime committed against *Joseph*, *Gen.* xlix. 5. or the Fornication of *Zimri* the *Simeonite*, upon account of which the Wrath of God was greatly kindled, *Numb.* xxv. 14. Or lastly they think it might have been, because this was the most inglorious of the Tribes, neither had *Moses* any particular Reason for blessing it, since they neither abounded in Numbers, nor did they inhabit one Place, but were dispersed through several Tribes, and taken in among them as it were in Courtesy only, and were not famous either for their Exploits, or the Fertility of the Soil: Others with *Junius* and *Tremellius* plead, that *Simeon* was by a Synecdoche comprehended under *Judab*. We do not think that *Moses* intended to deprive *Simeon* of a Benediction altogether, but we rather incline with *Le Clerc*, to suppose *Simeon* to be included in *Reuben*, (as a little below, ver. 18. the divine Prophet comprehends *Zebulun* and *Issachar* under the same Form of Blessing) although he had never named this Tribe in the Text; and that not only because *Simeon* was born next to *Reuben*, which *Le Clerc* takes Notice of, but chiefly because both of them being concluded under much the same Fate, he might properly predict their future Circumstances in the same Words. Not to mention this Consideration, which perhaps is not of so great Weight, that *Simeon's* Camp was next to that of *Reuben*, upon the South Side of the Tabernacle, which at that time *Moses* had in his View. And we think that some ancient Interpreter observed this; And therefore for a Help to the Memory, and for clearing up the Thing, at this Verse noted down the Name of *Simeon* upon the Margin, which through the Sagacity of
the

the Librarian, was afterwards taken into the Text, and prefixed to the latter Part of the Verse.

Thirdly, The Truth of the History does not well correspond with Mr. *Whiston's* ingenious Contrivance. For as *Moses* foretels to the Tribes things to come, not those already past; so this Tribe was so far from excelling the Rest of the Tribes in Number, that both before in the Desert, none suffered so great Diminution and Loss as they did, being reduced from 59000, to 22200, *Numb. xxvi. 14.* and in after Ages they never so increased in Numbers as to be able to vie with the Rest of the Tribes. As therefore *Reuben*, when his Father gave Blessings, was for a Crime committed thrust out from the Honour of Primogeniture, *Gen. xlix. 3.* so *Simeon*, for another Crime committed upon the *Shechemites*, is here excluded the Glory of having a great Multitude of People descending from him. Compare *1 Chron. iv. 27.* However, the *Greek Translation* about *Simeon*, is so far from being agreeable to Truth, that it does not faithfully translate the Original, since מתי מספר *Matby Mispar*, does not signify πολλοὶ ἐν ἀριθμῷ *many in Number*, but a small Number of Men, which may be seen from the constant Use of this Phrase in Scripture, *Gen. xxxiv. 30. Deut. iv. 27. 1 Chr. xvi. 19. Ps. cv. 12. Jer. xlv. 28.* And this is also evident from the similar Expressions which import Fewness or Want, as אנשי מספר *Anshy Mispar*, a few Men. *Ezek. xii. 16.* ימים מספר *Yamem Mispar*, a few Days, *Numb. ix. 20.* שנים מספר *Shanem Mispar*, a few Years. *Job xv. 20.* שנות מספר *Sbanoth Mispar*, a few Years. *Job xvi. 22.* And therefore the *Vulgar* render it better, *parvus in numero*, *small in Number*. And *Castalio*, *sed sit numero paucus*, *Let him be few in Number*, and *Megalander Lutherus*, *Und sein pæbel sey geringe*. *And let his People be few.*

“ He

Obj. XX. P. 69. " He appeals to the Order and
 " proper placing of the four last Chapters of the
 " Book of *Judges*. For the Accounts given in those
 " Chapters, ch. xviii. i. xxi. 25. are referred to the
 " Times in which *there was no King in Israel, but eve-*
 " *ry Man did that which was right in his own Eyes;*
 " which Description is rightly explain'd of the
 " Times next after the Death of *Joshua* and the El-
 " ders who outliv'd him, before *Judges* were set
 " over the People. From whence it is manifest,
 " that those historical Accounts would be more
 " properly placed a little after the Beginning of
 " the Book; wherefore *Josephus* hath put them in
 " between the 10th and 11th Verses of the se-
 " cond Chapter, to which indeed they plainly
 " belong, as also the History which is told us,
 " ch. xvii. about *Micab's* Idol. Neither does the
 " Book of *Ruth* appear to be rightly plac'd, be-
 " cause her Story happen'd after the Death of
 " *Samson*, where *Josephus* places it.

Ans. First, We agree with Mr. *Whiston* in this
 * Chronology, having professedly treated of the
 Time of the historical Facts contain'd in those
 Chapters, and made it appear, that they belong
 to that Age which pass'd between the Death of
Eleazar and the Government of *Othniel*, from
 chronological Calculations there set down. But
 God forbid that from this Calculation of Times,
 we should infer any disjointing of the Text,
 Transposition of Chapters, Confusion of Order,
 or other such Flaw, as *Spinosa*, or Father *Simon*
 might urge against the Perfection of the Scrip-
 ture. Certainly the supreme Author of this Book
 had very weighty Reasons, for putting those hi-
 storical Facts at the End of the Book, which
 in respect to order of Time, might have de-

manded a higher Place; although it hath not pleased him to communicate those Reasons to us, neither are we able to give an exact Account of them. For as to this Point also, *τίς ἔγνω νῦν νοεῖς*; *who hath known the Mind of the Lord?* we can by no means approve that way of accounting which ¹ *Lightfoot* hath advanced. Yet if we may have leave to conjecture, this historical Narrative haply proceeds upon this Foundation, that these Chapters give an Account of such Actions, as belonged only to the Affairs of private Persons, or to one or two Tribes only, or to one Part of the Land of *Canaan*, or *Israelitish* Nation, but did not concern the whole Body of that People. For the principal Design of the Book being to give us an Account both of the *Israelitish* Commonwealth and Church in the Land of *Canaan*, through a continued Course of several Ages, in the same Thread of History with the Book of *Joshua*, the Holy Ghost would not in the beginning of it interrupt or retard the History, by inserting private Transactions, but would come directly to the Deliverances and Actions of the Judges, and so compose an entire and uninterrupted Description of publick Affairs; and then, by way of an *Appendix*, subjoin in the last Part of the Book, two Instances of the corrupted State of the *Israelites*, which discover to us the first Original of their suffering by hostile Oppressions, and the Occasion of raising up Judges to protect them.

Secondly, ^m We have carefully searched into the Time of *Ruth*, and as to her Marriage with *Boaz*, we have placed it in the Time of that Peace which was procured to *Israel* by *Ehud*, and within

¹ In Chron. temp. V. Test. t. i. opp. p. 45.
lib. c. ii. S. 6. p. 202, &c.

^m Citat.

the Days of his Government, or perhaps a little after his Death, or at least thirty Years before the *Canaanitish* Oppression by *Jabin*. But since her History written in a Book by itself, hath another and quite different Design from the Book of *Judges*, it could not, according to the Series of Times, be otherwise placed, but as the next Book to the *Judges*. For to have inserted one Book into another, or to have intruded this History into the Middle of the Book of *Judges*, would have been so contrary to the Rules of just Method, that it would undoubtedly have been censured by Mr. *Whiston*, had he found it to be so in Fact.

OBJ. XXI. Page 70. "He pleads, *Judg. xviii.*
 " 1. Where in the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Copy it is said,
 " that in the Time they had no King, *the Tribe of*
 " *the Danites sought them an Inheritance to dwell*
 " *in, for unto that Day all their Inheritance had not*
 " *fallen unto them among the Tribes of Israel*; which
 " contradicts what we read, *Josh. xix. 40, 48.*
 " where the Portion of the Tribe of *Dan* is de-
 " scribed with those of the other Tribes. More-
 " over, *Judg. i. 18.* *Judab* is said to have took
 " *Gaza* and its Coast, and *Askalon* with its
 " Coast, and *Ekron* with its Coast, three of the
 " five famous Cities of the *Philistines*; and this
 " in direct Opposition to the sacred History,
 " which testifies that the *Philistines* always pos-
 " sessed those Cities. Therefore the *Septuagint*
 " truly deny that the Tribe of *Juda* had those Ci-
 " ties in Possession, which ^a *Josephus* also con-
 " firms.

ANSW. First, The first Difficulty is easily answer'd. *Joshua* had certainly assign'd to this Tribe

^a Antiq. l. 5. cap. 2.

their Portion, as it is largely describ'd *Josh. xix. 40, 48.* but the *Philistines* and *Amorites* still possess'd it, and the *Danites* were dilatory in expelling them. But although afterwards the greater part of this Tribe obtained their Inheritance in *Zareah* and *Eshtaol*, and also in *Laisb*, which they took by Surprize; *Judg. xviii. 2. Josh. xv. 47.* yet the *Amorites* beat them back, kept them within the Straits of the Mountains, and allowed them not to descend into the Valley, *Judg. i. 34.* What therefore is affirmed in *Josh. xix.* about the Appointment of an Inheritance, That in *Judges xviii. 1.* is denied only of the actual and total Possession of the Lot appointed them; so that there is no Contradiction to be found between those two Places. Neither is this contradicted by the following Words; 'כי לא נפלה לו וגו' *For to that Day their Inheritance had not fallen unto them.* These Words do not deny the Appointment and Description made by *Joshua*, but only their actual inhabiting the Places assigned them, as we see from the Words immediately preceeding 'מבקש לו' *They sought them an Inheritance for them to dwell in;* therefore the whole Inheritance assign'd to the Tribe of *Dan*, had not as yet fallen to them to be inhabited. It had fallen to them while *Joshua* was alive to subdue it, but the Land had not yet been actually conquered, it had not hitherto fallen to them to hold and possess it.

Secondly, Neither is there any more Difficulty in the latter Passage. From the positive Assertion of *Judg. i. 18.* it is very clear, that the Tribe of *Judah* attacked, and successfully conquered those three Lordships and Cities situated upon the Western and Maritime Coast, *Gaza, Askelon* and *Ekron*. Again, from *Judg. iii. 3.* and *Josh. xiii. 3.* it appears, that the five Lordships of the *Philistines*, and their chief Cities, *Askelon, Ekron, A-*

zotus,

Asotus, *Gath* and *Gaza*, with their Villages and Towns, at the Death of *Joshua* remained unconquered, that by them the Fidelity of the *Israelites* might be proved, and that they might be instructed in the Method of War even by their Enemies. Whence it is easy to conclude, that albeit the Tribe of *Judab* overcame and possessed those three Cities, yet the *Philistines* very soon recovered and repaired them; either because the *Israelites* left them and would not inhabit those Cities after they had plundered and laid them waste, and thereupon gave the *Philistines* a fair Opportunity of returning and repairing them, which is the Opinion of *Seb. Schmidius*; or because for the Sins and Iniquities of the new Inhabitants, God, in his just Judgment, suffered the *Philistines* within a short time after to expel the *Israelites* out of those Cities, and to take them again to themselves. For when the Lord so often delivered the *Israelites*, because of their Sins, into the Hands of the *Philistines*, and the other Nations remaining in *Canaan*, who can doubt but that they took their own Cities from the *Israelites* again, and re-enjoy'd them? Therefore we are so far from preferring the *Septuagint* Reading, that we rather believe it proceeded from the Ignorance and rash Tampering of some unlearned Smatterer, who reading that those Cities were taken by the *Jews*, which notwithstanding from what follows, he understood to remain still in the Hands, and under Command of the *Philistines*, and not knowing how to answer that Difficulty, he inserted the Particles *καὶ* and *οὐδὲ*, *not* and *neither*, so often into this Verse, that from an Affirmative, as he had found it, he might make it Negative. The same Reason may hold with respect to *Josephus*, because

he followed the false Translation which he made use of.

OBJ. XXII. Page 73. " He farther appeals to
 " 1 Sam. xvii. 4. where the *Hebrew* and some
 " *Greek* Copies read, that *Goliath* was six Cubits
 " and a Span high, and by consequence, that he
 " was almost twelve Foot in Height, which is
 " altogether incredible. But in other Copies of
 " the *Septuagint*, to which *Josephus* assents, *Goliath*
 " is said to have been only four Cubits and
 " a Span, about eight Foot high, which seems to
 " be very probable, and the common Reading
 " to be corrupted.

ANSW. Here we evidently see what implacable Hatred our Adversary has conceived against the original *Hebrew*, who has the Confidence to prefer a particular Reading of the *Greek* Version to the *Hebrew* Text, if possibly he may but throw the Odium of Corruption upon it. The *Aldin* Edition, and the *Alexandrian* Copy, agreeable to the *Hebrew* Text, do faithfully affirm, that *Goliath* was, ἕξ πηχέων ἢ ἀρταμῆς, six Cubits and a Span high; but because *Josephus* says τεσσάρων πηχέων ἢ ἀρταμῆς, four Cubits and a Span in height, we must bind ourselves up to this different and doubtful reading, although none of the Paraphrasts agree with him in it, for the sake only of casting a Reproach upon the Original. No Man will certainly say that this prodigious Stature is incredible, but he who takes Pleasure in disparaging the original *Hebrew*. That Monster of a Man was an Astonishment and Terrour to all the Camp of the *Israelites*; but if he had not been more than four Cubits and a Span high, he had not much exceeded *Saul* in Stature, who was higher than any of the People from the Shoulder and

upward, 1 Sam. x. 23. It is not then incredible, that he should be twice as tall as the common Stature of another Man.

OBJ. XXIII. Page 73. " Again he pleads, 2 Sam. xv. 7. where, when it is said, *And it came to pass at the End of forty Years, that Absalom said to the King, &c.* forty Years are supposed to have past from the Reconciliation of *Absalom* with his Father, to the Time of his Rebellion: Which is repugnant both to Truth and to the whole History of *David*, who indeed reign'd in all but forty Years. The genuine Reading therefore had only four Years, as ⁹ *Josephus* hath told us from his Copy, which exactly agrees with the whole History.

ANSW. Our Adversary hath taken this from ^r *Hugo Grotius*, whose Words are, " This is certainly an Error in the Writing, there being two Letters added to the Word ארבע *Arbang*, four: for *Josephus* and *Theodoret* say, that only four Years passed, the Truth of which, the thing itself declares." But this is against the Faith of all Copies and Translations. Upon which Account Commentators are at some Pains in settling this Doubt, but leave the Text as it is; neither indeed do the *Papish* Interpreters alter it. All the Doubt ariseth from the Uncertainty of the *E-pocha* which this Text follows. There are two Hypotheses most considerable: One fixes the beginning of those forty Years, upon the Time when *David* was first anointed by *Samuel*; the other, makes those Years commence from the first Beginning of *David's* Reign over *Israel* in *Hebron*. The latter Opinion is liable to this Disadvantage, that *David's* Flight and Restoration to the Kingdom, after the Death of *Absalom*,

⁹ Lib. 7. Antiq. c. 9.

^r Annot. ad h. l.

would fall almost upon the last Year of *David's* Life, for *David* did not reign above forty Years from his first Inauguration in *Hebron*, 1 King ii. 11. 2 Sam. v. 4. But it is plain from the History of *David*, that these Transactions of *Absalom*, happened a considerable Time, before the last Period of *David's* old Age. Wherefore we think the first Opinion best, which commences this Date from the divine Appointment, and first Anointing of *David* to the Kingdom.

OBJ. XXIV. Page 74. " He pleads 1 King xiii. " where the Name of the Prophet who was sent " from *Juda* to reprove the Idolatry of *Fero-* " *boam*, is not taken notice of in the *Hebrew* " or *Greek* Text, yet it is known from the " Copies of those Bibles, which were used in the " first Century, that in *Hebrew* he was named " *Jadon*, and in the *Greek* *Adonias*. Thence it " is that * *Josephus* and the † *Apostolical Constitu-* " *tions* have taken those Names, and transmit- " ted them down to our Age. In like Manner " 1 King xxii. 34. 2 Chr. xviii. 33. the Name " of him who killed King *Abab* is not mention'd: " Yet we learn from the ‡ *Antiquities* of *Jose-* " *phus*, that in his Copy the Man's Name was " *Aman*.

ANSW. First, The Name of this Prophet is related so differently and so perplexedly both by *Jews* and *Christians*, that their Disagreement about the Name, may make it justly suspected. * *Abarbanel* and † *Seder Olam* testify, that he is called by the *Jewish Rabbies*, *Iddo*, and is supposed to be the same of whom mention is made, 2 Chr. ix. 29. And I doubt not but *Josephus* means both the same Person and Name, when he

* Lib 8. Antiq. c. 3.

† Lib. 4. c. 6.

‡ Lib. 8. c. 3.

z Ad 1 King. xiii. 1.

y Cap. 20.

calls him 'Iádaw, and the Chronicle of *Metaphrastes*, not yet published, writes it 'Iádaw. He is named *Jaddun* in the Chronicles of *Freculfus*, *Addo* by ² *Jerom* and ^a *Isidore*: Finally, he is called *Iddo* in the Chronicles of the Monk of *Auxerre*. But the History of this Chapter clearly refutes that Opinion, relating of this Prophet, about whom we are inquiring, that he was killed by a Lion in the Way, and so could not return home; but *Iddo*, who flourished in the Time of *Abijah*, was much later than this historical Account, which falls in with the Beginning of the Reign of *Jeroboam*. But what is told of *Iddo*, ² *Chron.* ix. 29. that he wrote the Life and Actions of *Jeroboam*, hath surely given Occasion to this uncouth Conjecture. ^b Others again make this Prophet's Name *Odeth*, which was the Name of the Father of *Azariah* the Prophet, ² *Chron.* xv. 1, 8. whom the Calculation of Times will not allow to be the same with him we are seeking after; and much less his Son *Azariah*, who is still farther distant from this History; although ^c *Eusebius* hath it, 'Αζαείας, ὁ υἱὸς 'Αδδῶ, and ^d 'Εζαεῖ, ὁ υἱὸς 'Αδδῶ. Finally, I would desire Mr. *Whiston* to prove, that *Jadon* in *Hebrew*, is the same with 'Αδωνίας, *Adonias* in *Greek*, which he asserts without any Authority. From all which Considerations it is evident, that the Ancients, who have so variously given us the Name of this anonymous Prophet, did not follow any known Reading of an ancient Copy, but indulging their Fancy, made divers Conjectures.

Secondly, *Josephus* has indeed the Name of *Aman*: And he hath also many Things in his Books of Antiquities, without any Authority of the *He-*

² Init. com. in Zach. ^a Lib. de Vit. & Morte Sanctorum, c. 54. ^b In Chron. Alexand. p. 218, 220. ^c Lib. 1. Chron. ^d Lib. 2.

brew Text, which do not merit Belief, and as to which *Josephus* himself does not so much as pretend to persuade his Readers, that they were taken from Scripture. Indeed Christianity would be very ill dealt with, if *Josephus* were to be more credited than the Holy Scriptures; which if any Person dare assert, truly he must be altogether unacquainted with the sacred History, and be an unreasonable Man, and indeed plainly prophane.

OBJ. XXV. Page 74. " He farther appeals to
 " 1 *Kings* xiii. where he disputes the Truth of the
 " History, pretending it highly incredible, as it
 " is told in the *Hebrew*, that God should have
 " graciously revealed himself, and told the Punishment of the true Prophet, to the false Prophet of *Bethel*, who had deluded the true Prophet of God with a feign'd Tale, and who (as is credible) was a Priest or Prophet of that Idol, which *Jeroboam* had set up at *Bethel*. On the other hand *Josephus* testifies, that this was read very differently in his Copy; for upon his Authority and Fidelity, ^e he avers, that God spoke not to the false Deceiver, but to the true Prophet who was seduced, which Reading is evidently confirmed from the 26th Verse of the same Chapter.

ANSW. By this Instance it is evident, that what *Velleius* observes about bad Examples, is equally true of Errors, that they don't stop where they have begun, but being once let into a narrow Passage, they force their Way all around; and when Men have once wander'd out of the way, they are sure to run upon a Precipice. For after our Adversary hath been so bold as to obtrude Names into the sacred Text, upon *Josephus's* Authority, he next takes upon him to cen-

^e Lib. 8. Antiq. c. 3. S. 9.

ure and almost to disallow of God's own Revelation, as if it were not to be judged of by the Testimony of Scripture, but upon the Approbation of *Josephus*.

First, But this perverting of the Words of Scripture which *Josephus* gives into, proceeds upon a false Hypothesis, as if that old Man of *Beth-el* had been a wicked false Prophet; Πονηρὸς ψευδοπροφήτης, ὃν εἶχεν ἐν τιμῇ Ἰεροβοάμ[†] ἀπαλάμην[‡] ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, τὰ πρὸς ἡδονὴν λέγωντος, *A malicious false Prophet, whom Jeroboam honour'd, and by whom he had been seduc'd, and who spoke every thing to flatter his Humour.* But [†] *Herm. Witsius* and [‡] *David Knibbe*, have solidly remov'd the Injury done him, and have prov'd him to be a true Prophet of God. The old Man indeed was to blame in many Respects; remiss in his Duty for fear of *Jeroboam*, slack and tongue-tied as to reproving and preaching against his Idolatry: As also deceiving with lying Words an uncautious Man, unacquainted with Disguises, and inticing him to Disobedience; and pretending the Name of God, by a most horrible Abuse, for the countenancing his Lies, to the exceeding great Detriment of another Person: Yet the general Behaviour of the Man, permits us not to doubt, but that he was devoted to the true Worship of the supreme God, and that he enjoy'd the divine Gift of Prophecy. For the great Honour he did the Man when alive, and after Death burying him honourably, and mourning over him according to Custom, and calling him *my Brother*, shew, that both of them were Ministers of the same Religion, Worship, and God: But especially the 32^d ψ, in which by Impulse of the divine Spirit, he confirmed the Prophecy a-

[†] Misc. Sac. l. i. c. 15. S. 24, &c.
l. i. c. 14. S. 7.

[‡] In Hist. Prophet.

gainst the Altar of *Betbel*, foretelling that it would most surely come to pass, leaves no Place for the former Calumny. For it cannot be that a false Prophet should disapprove of his own Way of Worship, and declare that it should be destroyed by the Vengeance of God from Heaven. In no Place does the Scripture blame him for Idolatry, but it honours him every where simply with the Title of a Prophet.

Secondly, It is destitute not only of all Authority both of Copies and Versions, but it expressly contradicts the Original, where *ψ. 20.* the Word of God is said to be given, *אל הנביא אשר השיבו* *To the Prophet who had brought him back again.*

Thirdly, Neither does he find any Countenance in the 26th Verse, where we may conclude, what Word of God was spoken to the disobedient Prophet, from Verse 8, *Ec.* whence it is very clear, that he was forbidden by God under the Penalty of Destruction, either to eat Bread or drink Water in that Place. Upon all which Accounts we stand by the reading of the Original, which is not at all corrupted, nor contains any Absurdity: And we shall never suffer our selves to be beaten out of it by the frivolous Authority of *Josephus*.

OBJ. XXVI. Page 75. " He pleads, 1 *King. xv.*
 " 2. where the Mother of *Abijah*, who was the
 " Son of *Rehoboam* King of *Judah*, in the *Hebrew*
 " and *Greek* Text is called *Maacab*, the Daugh-
 " ter of *Abfalom*, and this is confirmed 2 *Chron.*
 " xi. 20, 22. where she is twice called *Maacab*
 " the Daughter of *Abfalom*, with a little Variation.
 " It appears from the Context, that there is a
 " Corruption here, for the Place already cited,
 " 1 *King. xv. 9, 10.* says, that *Maacab* Daughter
 " of *Abfalom*, was Mother of *Afa* Son of *Abijah*;
 " and 2 *Chron. xiii. 2.* it is said, that the Mother
 " of

“ of *Abijah* was *Micajah*, or *Maacab* the Daughter of *Uriel* of *Gibeab*.

ANSW. This is one of *Cappellus's* Arrows, repelled by ^h *Buxtorf*, who shews us the various Ways of making up this Difference, used both by the *Christians* and the *Jews*. We are most satisfied with that which makes *Maacab* to be the Daughter of *Abfalom*, (*David's* Son) not by Nature, but by Adoption. For she was the Daughter of *Thamar* the Sister of *Abfalom*, formerly ravished by her Brother *Amnon*, who seems afterwards to have had *Uriel* of *Gibeab* for her Husband. Upon which Supposition, both Parts are true, that *Maacab* was Daughter of *Abfalom*, and also of *Uriel*. And it is no way strange, that she was called *Maacab*, since she might have had two Names; not to speak of the Conjecture of ⁱ *Nic. Arnoldus*, that the Name *Maacab* was a common or appellative Name of the eldest Daughter in the Kingdom of *Geshur*. For the Mother of *Abfalom*, 2 Sam. iii. 3. and his Daughter here, and his Grand-daughter, [†] 10. are all of them named *Maacab*. But the constant Reading in all Copies and Versions, removes all Suspicion of Corruption; and the *Masoreths* never made any Doubt here, who, when they affixed their Notes upon the Word מִיכָאֵב *Micajabu*, wheresoever it occurs in Scripture, would have taken notice of the Error, if they had found any. But that one and the same Person should have different Names, and again, different Persons the same Name in holy Scripture, is a Thing so evident, that it needs no Proof by Examples. Hence Difficulties arise to us, who have no perfect Knowledge of Persons, which were no Difficulties at that Time when

^h *Anti-crit.* p. 2. c. 13. p. 920, &c. ⁱ *Luce in tenebris* in h.l.

those Men were alive. We see the same Things very often happen in our Days, in Genealogies and profane Histories.

OBJ. XXVII. Page 76. " He says, that there is
 " mention made of an Earthquake, *Amos* i. 1. in
 " the Time of *Uzziab*, King of *Judah*; which is
 " also spoken of *Zech.* xiv. 5. From which places
 " it is evident, that the Land had a most frightful
 " Earthquake during the Reign of this King.
 " Yet there is not a Word of it in the History
 " of *Uzziab*, either in the Books of the *Kings* or
 " *Chronicles*. No doubt but *Josephus* us'd bet-
 " ter Copies, who ^ksays, that it came to pass in
 " the Time of *Uzziab*, that the Earth trem-
 " bled when he entred the Temple, to offer In-
 " cense to the Lord. From this you may con-
 " clude, that in the Time of *Josephus*, this Hi-
 " story was read in its proper Place, 2 *Chr.* xxvi.
 " Moreover our Adversary adds, that upon a
 " particular Examination, it seems to him that
 " the Books of the *Kings* of *Judah* and *Israel*, so
 " often cited in the *Chronicles*, are the same with
 " the two Books of *Samuel*, and the two Books
 " of the *Kings*, written by the Prophets *Samuel*,
 " *Gad*, *Nathan*, *Iddo*, and others, (or as the
 " LXX more rightly call them, *the four Books of*
 " *the Kings*) contemporary to those several Kings.
 " And again, that the *Chronicles* so often cited in
 " those four Books of the *Kings*, are the same
 " larger Records or *Chronicles*, of which the two
 " Books of *Chronicles* now extant, are the A-
 " bridgments. These Conjectures the Author
 " proposes ^lto the Consideration of the learned.

ANSW. *First*, Here we must repeat what we have so often inculcated with Reference to *Josephus* his Books of Antiquities, that out of his

own Invention, he very often added Observations as to Times and Circumstances, yea whole Speeches and compleat Orations; not that he read it so in the *Hebrew* Copy of his Time, but because he intended to compose a full and perfect History; adorn'd with many Rhetorical Flourishes, taking his Hints partly from some Passages of Scripture, and partly from Traditions received from his Forefathers. Understanding from the Testimonies of *Amos* and *Zecbariah* already cited, that there was an Earthquake in the Reign of *Uzziab*, he, following the national Tradition, inserted it in its proper Place, and graced it with a richer Train of Circumstances. "For, the *Hebrews* give out, that this Earthquake happen'd, at the Time when *Uzziab* entring into the Temple of God, usurp'd the Office of Priesthood; then the Earth trembled, and the Ashes of the Altar were poured out, and the King himself was suddenly struck with Leprosy: they reckon that it was the twenty-fifth Year of the Reign of *Uzziab*, when these Things happen'd: The remaining Years of his Life were twenty-seven. Thus far ^m *Jerom.*" But what Man in his right Wits can from hence conclude, that there is any Omission in the 26th Chapter of the 2^d Book of the *Chronicles*? Many more memorable Things fell out in the 52^d Year of the Reign of *Uzziab*, than what the sacred History has left upon Record. For this Reason the sacred History refers its Reader at one time to the Books of the Kings of *Judah* and *Israel*, and sometimes to their *Chronicles*; for in the compendious Way of Writing used in the canonical Books, it had not been to the Purpose to

^m Comm. in c. 7. Isa. T. 5. opp. f. 15. G. & Comm. ad cit. loc. Zach. & Amos.

give any more tedious Accounts about their Kings.

Secondly, As to those Books of the Kings and Chronicles quoted in the sacred History, we have in another Book deliver'd our Opinion at full length, and confirmed it by Arguments, shewing how very absurdly and unreasonably *Spinosa*, *Grotius*, *Cappellus*, *Clericus*, *Rich. Simonius*, and their Associate Mr. *Whiston*, have imagined our Chronicles to be nothing but a very short and mutilated Abridgment of a much larger Book now lostⁿ. But there is no Necessity of inserting these Things here.

OBJ. XXVIII. Page 78. "He appeals to *Psal.* xxii. 17. where he charges the *Jews* with a gross and groundless Corruption, who in Place of the Verb כָּאָרוּ *Caaru*, they pierced my Hands and my Feet, have substituted the Noun כָּאָר *Caare*, as a Lion my Hands, &c. Against the universal Consent of all Copies, and against the Sense of the Verse also, which calls for a Verb answering to *Hands* and *Feet*, &c.

ANSW. It would be undertaking to write an *Iliad* after *Homer*, to attempt a full Vindication of the Place, after the studied Labours of so many learned Men upon this Oracle. But the Thing may be dispatch'd in a few Words. Both Readings are supported by the Authority of ancient Copies, and the Testimony of the *Masora*. For the great marginal *Masora* having observ'd at *Numb.* xxiv. 9. that in two Places, viz. in the Place of *Numb.* just now cited, and *Psal.* xxii. 17. the Word כָּאָר *Caare*, is to be seen, expressly adds in the latter Place כָּאָרוּ כָּאָר *Caaru Catub*, it is written in some ancient Copies כָּאָרוּ *Caaru*. And Rabbi *Jacob Ben Chajim*, in the part of the great *Masora* אר *Ar*.

ⁿ In *Introd. ad Lib. Bibl.* V. T. p. 1.

Upon this Verse of the *Pſalm*, assures us, במקצה
 ספרים מרדוקים מצאתי כתוב כר וקר כארי In some of
 the most correct Books I have found it written כארי
 Caaru, which notwithstanding must be read כארי
 Caare, viz. according to the Tradition of the
 Rabbies. If therefore the ancient and primitive
 Reading was with ו Vau, which Mr. *Whiston* contends
 for, that Alteration has been made only in some
 Copies, not in others, which retain the ancient and
 genuine Reading intire, as the *Jews* themselves
 acknowledge: therefore let but ו Vau be substi-
 tuted in Place of י Yod, from ספרים מרדוקים the
 most correct Copies, and all is right. But since in
 our Time no Copy can be produced reading it
 כארי Caaru, neither is the Word put into the
 Number and Account of קרין וכתוב Keris & Ca-
 tibs, and the little *Masora* upon this Place in-
 forms us, that we ought to read it כארי Caare,
 withal observing, that the Word of this Prophe-
 cy so much disputed, is written with the same
 Letters as כארי Caare in Isa. xxxviii. 13. but
 differs from it in Signification; as also the ° *final*
Masora reckons up כארי Caare, in the xxii *Pſalm*
 and xxxviii of *Isa.* in the Catalogue of those Words
 which are written after the same Manner, but
 have a quite different Signification; so then we
 shall abide by כארי Caare, and shall maintain it to
 be the genuine and original Reading, but taking
 care that it be rightly explain'd. Not to men-
 tion different ways of accounting for this
 Word, we derive it from the obsolete Root כר
 Cur, which imports the same with כרה Carab,
 he pierced, from it comes כר Cur, a Furnace, or
 Vessel for melting Metals. Prov. xvii. 3. Deut. iv.
 24. and כר Cor, a Core, or dry Measure; both these
 Words so called from piercing, or making hol-

low. From this *Radix* is the Participle *Kal*, in the Plural כרים *Carem*, piercing. But as in another Case, in Verbs having their middle *Radix*, *Vau*, according to the changeable Nature of the Letters אהוי *Ebevi*, in Place of *Vau*, is put א *Aleph*, either quiescent in *Kametz*, as for Example רָאֲמוֹת *Romoth*, high, Prov. xxiv. 7. הַשְׁחָטוֹת *Hashtotem*, whiptine or pricking, Ezek. xxviii. 24. and Feminine הַשְׁחָטוֹת *Hashtotouth*, Ezek. xvi. 57. or moveable by (-:) *Kataf Patach*, as in וְרָאֲמָה *Varaamah*, and he shall be exalted, Zach. xiv. 10. So our Word is written after the same Manner כְּאֲרִים *Coaarem*. Lastly, the final מ *Mem* is cut off by the Figure *Apocope*, according to the Rule of Rabbi David Kimchi, who in his Grammar among other Things observes, about the Masculine Plural ending in מ *Em*, " There are plural שיבואו בחירק כמו שיבואו עם המם " used with the *Chirek* in the End, others have " *Mem* added to them." For Example ראש השלישי *Rosh Hasholeshi*, chief of the Captains, for השלישים *Hasholeshim*, 2. Sam. xxiii. 8. וכל צידני *Vachol Tzidoni*, and all the Sidonians, for צידנים *Tzidonim*. Ezek. xxxii. 30. So עמי *Gnami*, People for עמים *Gnamim*, which occurs thrice, as the *Masora* observes, and from thence *Elias Levita*, viz. in 1 Sam. xxii. 44. Psalm cxliv. 16. Lam. iii. 14. To them may be added other Examples from Gen. xl. 16. 1 Sam. xx. 38. xxiv. 14. Isa. xxxviii. 12. Cant. viii. 2. From all which it is evident,

¶ The Rabbies commonly omit the final *Mem* and *Nun* in Plurals Masculine and Feminine, putting a kind of *Apostrophe*, as thus, אֲדוֹנִי *Adoni*, for אֲדוֹנִים *Adonim*, בָּגָדִי *Bagadi*, for בָּגָדִים *Bagadim*. In Process of Time that Note of *Apostrophe* came to be omitted in some Words; and the Copists scrupling to supply the Defect, the Words were left imperfect; neither having the final Letter, nor the Mark of *Apostrophe*. Of this see *Vitringa* more at large. *Observat. Sacr.* Tom. I. p. 187. M. MARCUS.

that

that the plural Number ending with a single י *Yod*, without מ *Mem* added to it, is not disagreeable to the scriptural Usage, but frequently occurs there. And thus you have it demonstrated, as the *Masora* observes, that כָּאֲרִי *Caare*, in the xxii *Psalms*, agrees with that כָּאֲרִי *Caare* in the xxxviii of *Isaiah*, as to the Letters and way of Writing them, but that they are to be understood in a different Sense: For in one Place it is a Noun, in the other a Participle of the Verb כָּרָה *Cur*; in the one Place it signifies a *Lion*, in the other it imports *piercing*. In this Way the Difficulty is over, and the Translations perfectly agree. I do not forget the Arguments of the late venerable Abbot ¹ *Matth. Hillerus*, with which he attack'd both this Exposition and Analysis of the Word: But his Reasons have not mov'd me to change my own, or follow his Opinion. However, if any Man thinks fit to approve of his Interpretation, according to which אֲרִי *Ari*, signifies a *Stall* or *Fold*, then the Sense of the Text would be, *Companies of wicked Men have inclosed me; my Hands and my Feet are as a Stall or Fold, torn up with Harrows*. Yet from this our Adversary will reap no Advantage, neither will it bring the Text into Suspicion of Corruption.

OBJ. XXIX. Page 79. " He appeals to the
 " cxlv *Psalms*, where one whole Verse between
 " the 13th and the 14th Verses is dropp'd; as
 " to which the *Septuagint*, the old *Syriack*, and
 " vulgar *Latin* Translations, and the ² *Apostolical*
 " *Constitutions*, which expressly cited the
 " same Verse in the first Century, do certify
 " us, that it was in the *Hebrew* Text. The

¹ Peculiari in h. l. dissert. c. 2. Syntagm. Hermeneut
 p. 289, &c.

² Lib. 5. c. 7.

“ Composure also of the *Pſalm* discovers the O-
 “ miſſion, every Verſe of which, by the Law of
 “ *Acroſticks*, begins from a new Letter, accor-
 “ ding to the Order of the *Hebrew* Alphabet;
 “ but here there is a Blank found in the Letter
 “ ך *Nun*, which is wanting. So that here, where
 “ there ought to be twenty two Verſes, there are
 “ but twenty one.

ANSW. This alſo is one of *Cappellus*’s Obje-
 ctions, * who both complains of a Blank, and
 according to the Words of the *Greek* Verſion,
 hath taken the Freedom to reſtore the Verſe after
 this Manner, נאמן יהוה ברבריו וחסדו בכל מעללו *The*
Lord is faithful in his Words; and holy in all his
Works, whoſe Opinion *Hugo Grotius*, and (which
 is more ſtrange) *Sim. de Muis* follows. In this
 only our Adverſary differs from *Cappellus*, that
Cappellus thinks the Verſe to have been loſt from
 the Days of the *LXX* Interpreters to the Time
 of *Chriſt*; but our *Antagoniſt*, from the firſt Cen-
 tury after *Chriſt*, for ſo it behoved him to keep
 to his own Hypotheſis. But neither of the two
 give any ſufficient Reaſon. For what Neceſſity
 is there, that *David* ſhould have compos’d an
 intire *Acroſtick*, without miſſing a ſingle Let-
 ter? And although he did paſs over a Letter,
 what Imperfection can from thence be imputed
 to the *Pſalm*, when the Context and Senſe not-
 withſtanding remain intire? Neither is it neceſſa-
 ry that, with the trifling *Jewiſh* Rabbies, we
 ſhould vainly inquire into the Reaſons of omit-
 ting ך *Nun*, ſince this one Reaſon may ſerve for
 all, that the Holy Ghoſt in *Acroſticks*, did not
 at all Times bind himſelf up ſtrictly to the Or-
 der of the Letters. Thus in the xxv *Pſalm*, ב
Beth is wanting, but two Verſes begin with

* Lib. 4. Crit. S. c. 14.

ָ *Resh* and ֿ *Pe*. In the xxxvii *Psalms* and 28th Verse, the Letter ַ *Ain* is wanting in its Alphabet. And in the xxxiv *Psalms* ַ *Vau* is omitted, unless you divide the 6th Verse into two Parts, and then the last Verse makes one above the Number of the Alphabet. Here also the supreme Author of the *Psalms*, in passing over ַ *Nun*, hath thought fit to use the same Privilege, and the same Liberty. But by this Means, you'll say, there are no more than 21, whereas there ought to have been 22 Verses. Well, and by what Necessity or Law were 22 precisely requir'd? Does the holy Spirit compute Verses by the Number of Letters of the Alphabet? Yet the Versions it seems, have that Verse, and took it from the ancient and compleat *Hebrew* Copy! Let them have it, if you please, but it can never be proved that they took it from the *Hebrew*. Some ignorant Pretender, whether *Jew* or *Greek*, who, according to his weak Judgment, thought to supply the want of the Letter ַ *Nun*, committed here a gross Tautology, by inserting the 17th Verse; which, that it might appear a little different, was to be altered by turning the Noun צַדִּיק *Tzadick*, Righteous, into נָאֵמָן *Naaman*, Faithful, and Ways into Words. An admirable Contrivance, if it please Heaven! However, while under Pretence of an Acrostick, it might easily gain Credit enough with the Librarians, to make the counterfeit Verse be received into future Copies, the *Arabian*, *Syrian*, and *Latin* Translators, and the Author of the pretended *Apostolical Constitutions*, (whoever he was, certainly later than the first Century) were so far imposed upon by it, as to accept it for genuine. Yet it is wanting in all the *Hebrew* and *Chaldee* Copies, in *Aquila*, *Jerom*, *Theodoret*, finally in the *Hexapla* itself. Whence it is that an old Scholiast upon this forged Verse very

well observes: Ὀβελίσαι ᾧ τὸ, Πισὸς κύριος, δι' ὅλην τὴν στίχον, μήτε παρ' Ἑβραίοις φερομένη, μήτε καὶ πρὸς ἄλλοις ἐρμηνεύταις, *All this Verse, which begins with πισὸς κύριος, is marked with an Obelisk, for it is neither read in the Hebrew, nor in the other Interpreters.* These are a Specimen of Mr. Whiston's formidable Arguments.

OBJ. XXX. Page 81. " He appeals to the
 " Books of *Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel*, which
 " are single Books in our *Hebrew Copy*; but
 " there is Mention made of more Books of *Je-*
 " *remiah, Dan. ix. 2.* And although now we
 " read two distinct Prophecies of the LXX Years
 " Captivity, *Jer. xxv. 11. &c. and xxix. 10.* yet
 " it is without any Sign of the two distinct Books,
 " into which they were divided in the Age of
 " *Daniel.* Moreover, [†] *Josephus* testifies that
 " *Ezekiel* writ two Books concerning the Baby-
 " lonish Captivity. Besides, [‡] *Du Pin* and [×] *Cote-*
 " *lerius* speak of an Apocryphal Collection of Pro-
 " phecies passing under the Name of *Ezekiel*, divi-
 " ded into two Parts. Finally, [‡] *Josephus* assures
 " us, that *Daniel* wrote several Books extant in his
 " Time. And by what Authority the latter *Jews*
 " set aside such ancient Partitions of the Pro-
 " phets, it does not appear. But this is worthy
 " of Observation, that by the Alteration of the
 " Series and Partitions of the Book of *Daniel*,
 " some Alterations seem to have arisen in the
 " Matter and Coherence of the Prophecy itself.
 " Certain it is, that a noble Passage for the Proof
 " of the Resurrection of the Dead cited out of
 " *Daniel*, in the ^z *Apostolick Constitutions*, is twice
 " ascribed to the Angel *Gabriel*, as the Person

[†] Lib. 10. Antiq. c. 10.

[‡] Hist. can. Lib. 1. c. 1. p. 28.

[×] In canonem Apostol. 85.

[‡] Antiq. Lib. 10. cap. 12.

^z Lib. 5. c. 7.

" who

“ who delivered it, which in our present *Hebrew*
 “ Copy is assign’d to one not named. Lastly, for
 “ Confirmation of this, Mr. *Whiston* appeals to
 “ the famous ^a *Job. Alb. Fabricius*, where Testi-
 “ monies are produced, together with the Opi-
 “ nions of the Learned, concerning the *Apocry-*
 “ *phal* Books of *Jeremiah*, *Ezekiel*, and *Daniel*.

ANSW. Our Antagonist proceeds now from sin-
 gle Verses to entire Paragraphs: And if he says
 the less as to their being entirely lost, leaving us
 in Doubt upon that Head, yet he charges them
 roundly with Disorder and Confusion. But by
 what Argument will he be able to make this
 Point good, which is the main Thing in Question?

First, As to *Jeremiah*, he thinks *Daniel* disco-
 vers it; who, *chap. ix. 2.* says, that he understood
 ספרים *Bispharim*, by Books, the Number of the
 Years of the Captivity, and as appears from what
 follows, by the Books of *Jeremiah*. But is Mr.
Whiston ignorant, that the Word ספר *Saphar*, not
 only signifies a greater Volume, but single Sheets,
Epistles, and different Paragraphs, written upon
 different Schedules? Thus the Table of the Ge-
 nealogy of *Adam* inserted, *Gen. v. 1.* is called
 ספר חולדות אדם *Saphar Toldoth Adam*, the Book of
 the Generations of *Adam*; and yet Mr. *Whiston* does
 not therefore pretend that *Genesis* consists of many
 Books. So the Letter of *Jebu* to the Men of
Samaria, is called ספרים *Sepharim*, the Letters,
2 King. x. 1. and the Letters of *Abasuerus* to his
 Subjects, ספר המלך *Siphra Hamelech*, the Kings Let-
 ters, *Esth. iii. 12.* compared with *i. 22. viii. 10.*
 and yet no Man will make them so many different
 Books. Thus also we explain מגלת ספר ירמיהו *Me-*
giloth Saphar Yermajabu, the Roll of the Book of *Je-*
reemiah, *Jerem. xxxvi.* that the Roll comprehend-

^a Cod. Pseudepigr. Vet. Test. Num. 217, &c.

ed but some part of the Book, not the whole Body of his Prophecies. Again, the same Prophet, chap. xxix. 1. sent דברי הספר *Dibra Hasapbar*, [*the Words of the Letter*] an Epistle to the Captives in *Babylon*. From all which it is manifest, that each Part of his Prophecies, published at different Times, had the Appellation of ספרים *Sapbarem*, *Letters*, which being afterwards collected into one Volume, composed one collective ספר *Sapbar*, the Book of *Jeremiah*. Therefore when the Prophet signified the Number of the Years of Captivity in two distinct Prophecies, which perhaps *Daniel* also kept and perused in two different Sheets or Parchments, it is not to be wonder'd at, that he learned the Number spoken of, בספרים *Bespharem*, in, or from two different Recitals or Writings. And yet there is no Necessity to conclude from thence, that many canonical and written Books of *Jeremiah* were then extant. But suppose that his whole Book, as now extant, and those likewise of *Ezekiel* and *Daniel*, as our Adversary would have it, was of old divided into two or more Books, which afterwards, without any Note of Distinction, became joined into one, what follows? Was not the Book of *Psalms* formerly divided into five Parts, and yet without any Detriment to the Text, or to its Authenticity?

Secondly, But *Josephus*, says he, ascribes two Books to *Ezekiel*. Here ^b *Stephen le Moyn* hath saved us the Trouble of answering, who after considering all Things belonging to the Question, at length declares his Judgment, that in ancient Time the Prolix Book of *Ezekiel* was divided in two, the former of which reach'd to the 40th Chapter, the latter from thence to the End. And

^b Notis in varia Sacr. T. 2. p. 332, &c.

it is as clear as the Sun, that *Josephus* meant nothing else; for when ^e he reckons no more than two and twenty sacred Books, he could take in only one Book of *Ezekiel* in that Account.

Thirdly, The Case is the same also as to *Daniel*, for in the Recital of the Canon already mention'd, *Josephus* acknowledges but one Book of his, yea it is altogether false, that *Josephus* cites more than one Book of *Daniel*. For that he might be believ'd in those Things, which he had spoken of *Nebuchadnezzar* and others, towards the End of his xii Chapter, he in a general Way assures us, that he allows nothing to Conjectures or Traditions, but that he follows the Authority and Direction of the *Hebrew* Books, (not of *Daniel* only, but of others, as well the Canonical, as also of Prophane and Apocryphal Writers) and that he barely interprets them. How true that is we don't dispute now; only thence it appears, he does not assign more than one Book to *Daniel*. Further, as to the gross Calumny which Mr. *Whiston* adds with respect to *Daniel*, as if the *Jews* had corrupted the Text by altering the Division, he hath not made it out by any proper Proof. Only his Plea is, that in the falsely named *Apostolical Constitutions*, a Testimony of the Resurrection is ascrib'd to *Gabriel*, which in the *Hebrew* Copy is given to an anonymous Angel. Are then these spurious exploded Constitutions, and of no Credit, are they of more Authority with him than the *Hebrew* Text? And if they be, is therefore the Name of *Gabriel* omitted in that Place, because the one Book of *Daniel* is made up of many, as he alledges? What a trifling ridiculous Man is this, exposing to open View the Tokens of a blinded Mind, not asham'd to produce even

* Lib. i. contra Apion. p. 1036.

Apocryphal Books as Witnesses against the Perfection of the Canonical ones ! But what a Consequence is this ; there are extant Apocryphal Books of *Jeremiah*, *Ezekiel* and *Daniel* ; therefore their Canonical Writings are corrupted and mutilated ? Mr. *Whiston* hath either lost all Modesty, or the Use of his Reason, to draw such an Inference. The very learned *Job. Alb. Fabricius* hath treated of these Apocryphal Writings, as we ^c also have done, but so as to exclude them absolutely from the Canon, marking them as spurious, and leaving them destitute of all Authority and Credit.

OBJ. XXXI. Page 82. “ He appeals to *Ezek.*
 “ i. 1, 2, 3. where two distinct Times are specified pointing to different Prophecies, the fifth
 “ Year, and the thirteenth Year from the Captivity of *Jeboiachin* : but one only of those
 “ Prophecies, which refers to the fifth Year, being mentioned, it appears not what is become
 “ of the other. Our Antagonist had indeed at first conjectured, that the Date of the thirtieth
 “ Year belongs to the thirtieth Chapter ; but if
 “ so great a Dislocation should seem too improbable, he rather inclines to refer it to a Prophecy now lost. For That may appear highly
 “ probable to one who shall observe from what follows, that divers Prophecies of the *Messiah*
 “ are cited from *Ezekiel*, which are not to be found in his Book at this Time. Furthermore, since *Josephus* has mentioned two Books
 “ of *Ezekiel*, we may justly suspect that the Date here set, without its correspondent Prophecy,
 “ was originally at the Beginning of this Prophet’s second Book.

ANSW. Our Adversary makes a Difficulty where

^c In Introd. ad Lib. Bibl. suis locis,

there is none, and trifles after a ridiculous manner, only to perplex his Reader. The common Saying of the ^d *Rabbies* takes Place here; כל מקום שפקרו המינים חשובתן בעדן *Whenever Hereticks err, an Answer to them is ready at Hand.* For our Adversary wrests the Words of the first Verse, where שנה השלישית *the thirtieth Year* is reckon'd, which have an Answer and Vindication immediately subjoin'd in the second Verse, היום השנה החמשיה *This was the fifth Year of King Jehoiachin's Captivity.* These Words remove the whole Doubt, informing us that the same Point of Time is here noted, but which, according to the different Way of Computation, is in the one reckon'd the thirtieth, in the other the fifth Year. The one *Æra* is particularly specified from the Captivity of *Jehoiachin*, or *Jechonias*; but the other which is dubious, hath given Occasion to various Conjectures of Interpreters ^e. We have examined their several Opinions, and upon mature Consideration, have fixed upon that which seems to point out the Year of the Prophet's Age, when, according to the Law, he was of proper Age for his sacerdotal Function, and was called to his prophetical Office by a solemn Vocation. However it may be, it is needless to dispute that Point here; only let us hold by what the Text expressly says, that *the thirtieth Year* in the first Verse, is the fifth Year after the Transportation of *Jechonias*; which being duly observed, all our Sophister's Quibbles, either about the lost Prophecy, or the other Book of *Ezekiel*, vanish in Smoke.

Obj. XXXII. Page 84. " He next quarrels
" with the 42^d Chapter of *Ezek.* 16th and 20th

^d Talm. Bibl. Tr. סנהדרין *Sanhedrin*, f. 28. col. 2. & Hierosol. Tr. ברכות *Berachos*. cap. 11. ab initio. ^e *Introduct.*
ad h. l. p. 201.

“ Verses. Where according to the *Hebrew* Co-
 “ py, the Temple is described as a Square, each
 “ Side of which contain’d five hundred Reeds,
 “ according to the Measure of a Reed round a-
 “ bout it, that is to say, three thousand Cubits;
 “ which Measure would be more suitable to the
 “ entire City *Jerusalem*, than to the bare Court
 “ of the Temple. But it is well known, that
 “ this Court was no more than five hundred Cu-
 “ bits square. Nor is there any Sign that the
 “ Court of the future Temple will be larger than
 “ that of the old; nor indeed will the Measures
 “ of the new City *Jerusalem* bear such large Di-
 “ mensions for that Temple. Hence it appears,
 “ that the Word קנה *Caneh*, a measuring Reed,
 “ hath stolen into the *Hebrew* Text, in Place of
 “ אמה *Amah*, a Cubit. The Version of the
 “ LXX Interpreters hath preserved to us the ge-
 “ nuine Reading, setting down five hundred
 “ Cubits instead of five hundred Reeds.

ANSW. Not only this of the Courts, but like-
 wise the whole Description of the City and Tem-
 ple will exceed the Truth, if we understand *Eze-
 kiel’s* Vision literally, or of the latter Temple
 which was built by *Zerubabel*. For neither is its
 Situation agreeable thereto, nor the Extent of
 the City or Temple, by far too much enlarg’d by
Ezekiel, nor the Manner of Worship, nor the In-
 habitants of the City, nor the other Circumstances
 contain’d in this Description: whence it appears
 manifestly, that the whole Vision is to be taken
 mystically, for the Spiritual and Evangelical King-
 dom of *Christ*, described in Words and Phrases
 accommodated to the Jewish State, and taken
 from the Customs of those Times. All which *D.
 Hafenrefferus* hath illustrated, in his very learned
 and excellent Commentary, entituled, *The Tem-
 ple of Ezekiel*, to whom we refer the pious Rea-
 der;

der ; only we shall briefly represent the Meaning and Design of the Vision in his Words ^f, which are these ; “ Therefore not the external, but the
 “ heavenly and spiritual City *Jerusalem* is here
 “ described, the Name of which is, *The Lord is*
 “ *there*, (last Verse of the last Chapter). Not
 “ the Temple of *Zerubabel*, but the Temple and
 “ Church of *Christ* is described ; not the Levitical,
 “ but the Evangelical Worship ; finally not
 “ the Buildings, not the outward Mansions, but
 “ the Benefits of *Christ*’s Kingdom, its flourishing
 “ State, its Beauty and Magnificence are in this
 “ Vision painted before our Eyes. But all these
 “ Things are set out under Shadows and typical
 “ Phrases, taken from the Circumstances of
 “ Times, Places, and religious Ceremonies of
 “ that People to whom our Prophet intended to
 “ relate this Vision, which was shewn to him.”
 All which the Author above-mention’d, a Person as ingenious as he is learned, particularly prosecutes and copiously explains. These Things consider’d, the Reading stands entire and safe, and the Largeness of the Courts exactly answers the Dimension of the mystical *Jerusalem*.

^f Pag. 2, &c. —

CHAP.

C H A P. II.

Of the Citations out of the Old Testament made in the New.

“ THIS is Mr. & *Whiston*’s main Argument,
 “ for the great Corruption of the *Hebrew*
 “ Copies, that the Quotations in the New Testa-
 “ ment taken from the Old, do frequently and
 “ widely differ from the same Texts, as we now
 “ read them in the *Hebrew* Copy. For this is
 “ the known obvious way of discovering whether
 “ any ancient Books are uncorrupt or not, to
 “ compare the Citations made from them in old
 “ Time, with the later Copies, and if they al-
 “ most universally agree, to pronounce those
 “ Copies pure and accurate : But if they differ,
 “ especially in Things of Consequence, to pro-
 “ nounce them insincere and corrupt. Now since
 “ the Text of the New Testament quoted by
 “ *Christ* and his *Apostles*, do exactly agree with
 “ *Philo* and *Josephus*, and other Writers of the
 “ first Century, but vastly differ from the modern
 “ *Hebrew* Copy: Hence it is very evident, that the
 “ *Hebrew* Text hath been altered since the Times
 “ of the first Century. And this Mr. *Whiston*
 “ pretends to demonstrate by an Induction of
 “ Particulars, and an Examination of them.

z Propof. 2. S. 33. p. 86, &c.

PROPO-

And this he again repeats in his XIII PRO-
POSITION, p. 287.

Which is thus express'd:

*The Texts cited by our Saviour, his Apostles,
and the rest of the Writers of the New
Testament out of the Old, were truly cited
by them; and in Agreement with the genuine
Hebrew and Greek Bibles of that Age.*

“ This Proposition he endeavours to prove
“ by several weighty Reasons, which we shall
“ presently rehearse, and discuss one by one.

Here is open'd to us a large Field of Argument,
into which if we had a Mind to expatiate and en-
large according to the Dignity, Variety, and
Copiousness of the Subject, we should take a
Work in Hand, which would require Abundance
of Leisure, and by far exceed the Bounds I have
set for this Confutation. This Affair hath a long
Time ago been successfully manag'd by the re-
formed Doctors, ^h Janus Drusius, ⁱ Fran. Junius,
and last of all by a Person well versed in Talmu-
dick and Rabbinick Learning, namely ^k Guil. Su-
renbuius; although they do not all take the same
way to come at their Point. To them might be
added ^l Jac Altingius, in his *Parallelism of the Te-
stimonies of the Old Testament cited in the New*,
[which as deliver'd in his publick Prelections, his
Editors have subjoin'd at the End of the second
Tome of his Works] if his Work had been any
farther advanc'd than the 12th Chapter of St. Mat-

^h In Parallelis Sacr. Tom. 6. Crit. Sacr. ⁱ Parallelis Sacr.
lib. 3. ^k In ספר המשנה five βιβλα κατ'αλληλ'ης. ^l In
Parallelis Testim. V. T. quæ citant. in novo.

thew. Among our Countrymen, ^m *D. Job. Major* hath said much in a little Compass, which is publish'd at the End of *Hackspar's Sylloge*, or System of Theological and Philological Disputations, and will deserve an attentive Perusal. We, that we may not seem altogether wanting to our Charge, shall with all possible Brevity premise some Observations, according to which, if the Places disputed by our Adversary be examin'd, all will be safe, and his whole outcry about the Corruption of the Scripture will come to nothing.

I. And (*First*) Let us consider *the Difference of Citations*; as to which observe, N^o. i. That intire Sentences are quoted, for proving either Principles of *Faith*, or Rules of *Practice*, as *Matth.* iv. 10. compar'd with *Deut.* vi. 13. — *Rom.* x. 13. compar'd with *Joel* ii. 32. — *2 Cor.* vi. 2. compar'd with *Isa.* xlix. 8.

N^o. ii. That Prophecies are alledged, either as fulfilled, *Acts* ii. 25, &c. compared with *Psal.* xvi. 8. and cx. 1. or as to be fulfilled, *Rom.* xi. 26. compared with *Isai.* lix. 20. or as partly fulfilled, partly as yet to be fulfilled, *Acts* ii. 16, &c. compared with *Joel* ii. 28, &c.

N^o. iii. That Facts or Examples are cited for Proof, or for Illustration, *Mark* ii. 25. compared with *1 Sam.* xxi. 6. — *Rom.* iv. 3. compared with *Gen.* xv. 6. — *1 Cor.* x. 7, &c. compared with *Exod.* xxxii. 6. *Numb.* xxv. 1, 9. xi. 5, 6. xiv. 2, 36.

N^o. iv. That there are cited Facts and Sayings which are allegorically apply'd to Affairs of the New Testament, *Gal.* iv. 22, &c. compared with *Gen.* xvi. and xxi. — *1 Cor.* ix. 9. compared with *Deut.* xxv. 4.

N^o. v. That the Types from the Old Testa-

^m Disp. de dictorum in V. T. Novo allegatione.

ment are transferred to the Antitype in the New, as *John* xix. 36. compared with *Exod.* xii. 46. and *Numb.* ix. 12. — *John* iii. 14, 15. compar'd with *Numb.* xxi. 8, 9.

Nº. vi. That the Histories of the Old Testament are repeated in the New, either for Proof or for Illustration: As when St. *Stephen* repeats the History of the *Patriarchs* and *Moses*, *Acts* vii. 2, &c. and St. *Paul* the History of the *Israelites* in the Desert and in the Land of *Canaan*, *Acts* xiii. 17, &c.

II. Moreover (Secondly,) As to the Fountain and Place of the Texts cited. Observe

Nº. vii. That sometimes a Place of the Old Testament, from which a Quotation is made in the New Testament, is pointed out as it were with the Finger: As in *Matth.* iii. 3. and *John* xii. 38. *Isaiab* is mentioned by Name, and *Acts* ii. 29. *Rom.* iv. 6. *David* is also spoken of by Name.

Nº. viii. That under a proper Name sometimes is cited the Place of a Text, but not of the Author from whence it was taken, but of another Person, who hath left no such thing written in his Book; which arises from, and is to be judged of by the different Respect and Use of that Name. Thus, because *Jeremiab* (according to the Order received among the ancient *Jews*, and spoken of in the *Talmud*) was placed the first among the Prophets, therefore the whole Volume of the Prophets sometimes passed under his Name; and hence it is that *Matth.* xxvii. 9. a Prophecy is attributed to *Jeremiab*, which we read *Zach.* xi. not as if the sacred Writer had failed in his Memory, or that at that Time any such thing had been read in the Book of *Jeremiab*, but because in this Place the whole Body of the Prophets is understood by the Name of *Jeremiab*, and that Saying, *which is spoken by Jeremiab*, imports the same with

I

which

which is spoken in the Prophets: And thus Christ, Luke xxiv. 44. under the Names of the *Psalms*, comprehends the whole Copy of the *Hagiographa*, because the *Psalms* were placed first, *על פס* כתובים in the *Cetubem*, that is, *Holy Writings*.

Nº. ix. That a Quotation sometimes refers to many Places of the Old Testament taken together, or it respects the whole Parallelism of the Words or Phrases: For Example, *Rom. x. 15.* to *Isa. lii. 7.* and *Neb. i. 15.* — *Matth. xxi. 5.* to *Isa. lxii. 11.* and *Zech. ix. 9.* — *Luke iii. 4, 5, 6.* to *Isa. xl. 3, 6, 7, &c. lii. 10.* — *Luke iv. 18, 19.* to *Isa. lxi. 1, 2.* and *xlii. 7.* — *John vi. 31, 49.* to *Exod. xvi. 14, 15.* *Numb. xi. 7.* and *Psal. lxxviii. 24.* So in *Rom. iii. 13, &c.* several Texts of the Old Testament are tack'd together, from *Psal. xiv. 3. v. 10. x. 7. Isa. lix. 7. Psal. xxxvi. 3.* And thus *Luke xxiv. 46.* our Saviour himself in one general Expression, comprehends all the Testimonies of the Old Testament, which speak concerning the Death and Resurrection of Christ. Consult upon this Head *ⁿ Surenhusius* and *° Major*.

Nº. x. Sometimes the Thing quoted is no where to be found literally set down in the Old Testament, but it is cited from it according to the Sense, or even by Consequence; from whence we ought not to infer any Omission or Corruption of our present Copies, but to take heed to the Force of the Argument, and to study and search into the divine Logick and Manner of Reasoning used by the Holy Ghost. To this Head belongs *Matth. ii. 23. he shall be called a Nazarene*, which is no where in the Prophets, according to the strict Letter, but is by some referr'd to the Type of the *Nazarites*, *Gen. xlix. 26.*

ⁿ C. l. 2. Th. 2. p. 45, &c.

° C. l. S. 15. 17. 49, &c.

Judg.

Judg. xiii. 5. Psal. cxxxi. 18. with the Approbation of *p Frid. Spanheim*: By others it is referred to those Prophecies in which *Christ* is styled נצר *Natzar*, and צמח *Tzamach*, as *Isa. xi. 1. Jer. xxiii. 5. xxxiii. 15, &c.* to which *¶ Junius* as-
 sents: *¶ Herm. Witsius* after *Socinus*, ingeniously ap-
 plies it to those Places, in which the Son of God
 is called the נצר *Natzar*, *Preserver and Saviour*
of Mankind, Job vii. 20. Psal. xxxi. 24. Prov.
 xxiv. 12. compared with *Isa. xxvii. 3.* Another
 such Instance is, *1 Tim. v. 18. The Labourer is*
worthy of his Reward, which Words are taken
 from the Sense of the Law, *Levit. xix. 13. and*
Deut. xxiv. 14, &c. And *Ephes. v. 14.* is another
 like Instance, where the Words are drawn from
 the Sense of the Prophecy, *Isa. lx. 1.*

Nº. xi. Sometimes such Circumstances of the
 historical Accounts of the Old Testament, or
 such as have a near Connexion therewith, are
 mention'd in the New, as to which there is a to-
 tal Silence in the Old Testament: Of this Kind is
 that of the ninth Verse of the Epistle of St. *Jude*,
 the Dispute of *Michael* and the Devil about the
 Body of *Moses*: Such also is *2 Tim. iii. 8.* giving the
 Names of the *Egyptian Magicians*, *Jannes* and
Jambres. The Epistle of St. *Jude* *¶ 6.* speaks of *the*
Angels who kept not their first Estate, but left their
Habitations. Hither refer *Luke xvii. 26, 27, 28.* the
 Accounts which *Christ* gives of the Security of
 those who lived before the Flood, and of the Peo-
 ple of *Sodom*; and the six Months which *Christ*
 [*Luke iv. 25. and James v. 17.*] adds to the three
 Years Drought in the Time of the Prophet *Elias*,
1 Kings xviii. 1. which Things many suppose to

p P. 1. Dub. Evangel. 93. p. 613, &c. *¶ In parallel.*
Sacr. h. l. *¶ Dissertations 2. Meletem Leidenfium, quæ*
est in h. l. S. 16. p. 285.

have been taken from Apocryphal Books, others from Oral Tradition; we refer to immediate divine Revelation; as also those other Accounts which *Moses* hath given us of the Antediluvian Affairs, and the Creation of the Universe; or what *David*, *Psal.* cv. 18. hath told us about the Iron Fetters of *Joseph*. Next,

III. (*Thirdly*) Concerning the Words which are cited, observe,

Nº. xii. That sometimes the Sayings of the Old Testament are recited in the New, almost in the same Words, or with a very small Variation: For Example, *Matth.* iv. 4. from *Deut.* viii. 3. — *Matth.* iv. 7. from *Deut.* vi. 16. where *Moses* hath, *Do not ye tempt*; but St. *Matthew*, or rather our Saviour says, *Thou shalt not tempt*; — *Matth.* v. 24. from *Exod.* xx. 13. — *Matth.* xviii. 16. from *Deut.* xix. 15. — *Matth.* xxi. 42. from *Psal.* cxviii. 12. — *Rom.* iv. 3. from *Gen.* xv. 6, &c.

Nº. xiii. But sometimes the Sense only is retain'd, when the same is expressed in other Words: either by Addition, as *Matth.* xv. 9. is cited from *Isai.* xxix. 13. with this Addition, *In vain do they worship me*, &c. — *2 Cor.* vi. 17. is quoted from *Isai.* lli. 12. with this Addition, *Καὶ γὰρ ἐσθλὲς ἔσονται ὑμᾶς*, *And I will receive you*. — *Ephes.* v. 14. from *Isa.* lx. 1, 2. to the Words quoted is added, *Ὁ καθεύδων, ἔγεραι ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν*, &c. *Thou that sleepest, and arise from the Dead*. Or else by Omission, as *Matth.* iv. 15. in the Words cited from *Isai.* ix. 1. some Words are left out. In the Quotation of *Matth.* v. 33. from *Deut.* xxiii. 23. a Summary only is cited, — *Matth.* xii. 21. some Words which are in the Original, *Isai.* xlii. 4. are omitted. Or by the Change of Words, as *Matth.* xxi. 5. for *just, having Salvation, lowly*; which are in *Zach.* ix. 9. is put *meek*; — *Matth.*

iv. 10. the Word *only* is added; and for *thou shalt fear*, as it is in *Deut. vi. 13.* we have it, *thou shalt worship*, &c. But that upon these Accounts Corruption is not to be imputed to the Original, * *Major* hath excellently and solidly demonstrated against the Papists. For sometimes the Strength of the Argument, as taken rather from the Sense than from the Words, obliged them to recede from the strict Tenor of the Words in the Original: Sometimes Brevity required it, when Things were to be summarily mention'd, just as much as would serve the Purpose: Sometimes a fuller Illustration that was to be added to the Words of the Old Testament by way of Explication, required it; as is evident from *Acts ii. 17, &c.* compared with *Joel ii. 28, &c.* Sometimes the Application of a Testimony to the present Purpose, which might be properly made by changing the Words of the Prophecy a little: Sometimes a synonymous Expression wanted to be unfolded and explain'd, as *Matth. xxi. 16.* the Word *ἡ Γαζ, Strength*, from *Psal. viii. 3.* is explained by *αἶνον, Praise*, — *Luke iv. 18.* the Verb *חבש Chabash, to bind up*, from *Isai. lxi. 1.* by *ἰάσαθ, to heal*, and *ררur, Liberty*, is explained by *ἀφεσις, Remission or Forgiveness*. — So *John xix. 29.* *רוש Rosb, Gall*, of *Psal. lxxix. 22.* is explained by *ὑσσωπον, Hyssope*, because both of them are bitter; — *Acts ii. 26.* the Word *כבודי Kabode, my Glory*, from *Psal. xvi. 8.* by *γλῶσσά μου, my Tongue*; and *לבטח Lobatich, securely*, by *ἐπ' ἐλπίδι, in Hope* — *1 Cor. xv. 55.* cited from *Hosea xiii. 14.* for *דבר Dabar, Plague*, is said *κέντρον, a Sting*; and for *קטב Katab, Destruction*; *νικη, Victory*. Many such you may see in the above-named * *Surenhusius*. Fi-

* C. l. S. 33. † Lib. 3. Th. 19 & 20. p. 81, &c.

nally at other Times we need look no farther than the absolute Freedom and good Pleasure of the Holy Ghost, according to which he thought proper to substitute one Word in place of another; which ought so much the less to be wondered at or blamed, as it is a very common Thing in Quotations of this Kind, whether sacred or prophane, sometimes only to give the Sense in different and fewer Words; sometimes to repeat the very same Words, but turn'd a little to our Design and Purpose, and accommodated to the Connexion, yet without incurring the Imputation of Corruption.

Nº. xiv. Sometimes a Quotation is made not according to the *Hebrew* Text, but according to the *Greek* Translation, commonly called that of the LXX Elders, differing from the Original. In such a Case, do not imagine that the Writers of the New Testament countenance the Error of those Interpreters, occasion'd by any false reading, or wrong pointing; nor that they allow of it out of a Kind of Condescension; but that either both the Senses exactly correspond to the Truth, or that the reading of the *Septuagint* well explain'd the *Hebrew* Text, and illustrated the Sense of it. Thus St. Paul, Rom. x. 18. in Conjunction with the LXX Interpreters, clearly explains the Word קַוָּה *Kavam*, *their Line*, Psal. xix. 5. by φθῆγς αὐτῶν, *their Voice*: What is written in Isa. liii. 8. *He was taken from Prison and from Judgment*, St. Luke from the *Septuagint*, Acts viii. 33. thus recites: ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει αὐτοῦ ἡ κρείσς αὐτοῦ ἤφθη, *In his Humiliation, his Judgment was taken away*; because at that Time, the Eunuch was reading these very Words in the said *Greek* Translation:— In Psal. viii. 5. it is said, *Sivisti eum indigere Deo, thou didst suffer him to want or to be forsaken of God*. This is appositely explain'd

explain'd by St. Paul, in the Words of the Septuagint, Heb. ii. 7. ἡλάττωσας αὐτὸν βραχὺ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις, *Thou hast made him a little Lower than the Angels*: Thus the Word ברית Barith, a Covenant or Compact, is explain'd by the Apostle among his Quotations, after the Manner of the LXX Interpreters, by the Word Διαθήκη, a Testament, which declares the Nature of that Covenant more emphatically, Heb. ix. 20. Rom. ix. 4. We read Gen. xlvii. 31. and Israel bowed himself, אֵל רִמָּהּ וְהַמִּטָּה upon the Beds Head. St. Paul with the LXX render it, καὶ προσεκύνῃσεν τῷ τῷ ἄκρῳ τοῦ ῥάβδου αὐτοῦ, *And he worshipped upon the Top of his Staff*, because both these Gestures of Jacob, as he was worshipping God, agree with History, and with Truth: He bowed himself towards the Beds Head, and at the same Time leaned on his Staff, and so worship'd God.

Nº. xv. Although the Citations of the New Testament, may seem almost opposite and contrary to their Originals, and to the Words of the Places from whence they are quoted, yet if we take a more narrow View of them, they rather give us an Explication, and a Kind of Comment upon the Text of the Old Testament. For Example, when St. Paul, Heb. x. 5. has the Words, *But a Body hast thou prepared me*, so translating that of Psal. xl. 7. *Thou hast pierced my Ears*, he explains the Verb כָּרָה Cara, to pierce, by κατετίθεν, to prepare, and אזני Aznayem, Ears, by σῶμα, Body, because Christ both received his Father's Commands, with attentive Ears, and likewise presented himself with his whole Body in profound Obedience to his Father, who might fit it up for a Sacrifice to himself at Pleasure^v.

^v If the Reader likes not this Solution of our Author, he may see another (perhaps a more easy and natural one) in Elfner,

Thus what we read *Jer.* xxxi. 32. בעלתי בם *Bagnalti Bam*, *I ruled over them*, *St. Paul* *Heb.* viii. 9. renders ἐμέλησα αὐτῶν, *I regarded them not*, in order to aggravate the Severity and Hardship of that Rule. *Mic.* v. 2. it is said to *Bethlehem* צעיר להיוור באלפי יהודה *Thou art the least among the Thousands of Judah*, which is inverted and denied, *Matth.* ii. 6. ὁ δαμῶς ἐλαχίστη εἶ ἐν τοῖς ἡγεμόσιν Ἰούδα, *Thou art not the least among the Princes of Judah*: By which no small Light is given to the Prophecy of *Micah*, which makes *Bethlehem* small in respect of its Extent, outward Beauty, and Buildings, and no ways to be compared to other Cities of *Judea*; but *St. Matthew* opening the Completion of this Prophecy, informs us, that *Bethlehem* very much excell'd all others, and even the principal Cities of *Judah* in Honour and Magnificence, because the Saviour of the World was born in it; in the same Sense, that *Hagg.* ii. 10. foretels, that the Glory of the latter Temple, should by far exceed the Splendor and Magnificence of the former one. I am not ignorant, that another Method of reconciling this Difference has been suggested by * *Edward Pocock*, (which † *Jos. Frischmut* particularly undertook to defend, by referring the Word צעיר *Tzaber*, to the Number of those which import contrary Significations) so that in this Place it does not signify a little, but a chief and principal City, and so in truth, ὁ δαμῶς ἐλαχίστω, *not the least*. But this Opinion as to the main Substance and Import of it, rests upon the former Explication, ob-

[*Observat. Sacr. Tom.* 2. p. 362.] who shows that the Greek and Hebrew, though differing in the Expression, yet agree in the Meaning. MOSES MARCUS.

* In *Notis Miscell. ad portam Moysi C.* 2. & *P.* 12, &c.
† *Peculiari disput. Jenæ* 1662. habitâ.

serving

serving that *Bethlehem* was little as to the Number of Buildings and Stateliness of Structure, but became the greatest of all, in the Extent of its Fame, and the noble Actions done there, and chiefly by being the Birth-place of our Saviour. So also in *Psal. lxxviii. 19.* it is said, *Thou hast received Gifts for Men*, which is well explain'd by *St. Paul, Eph. iv. 8.* ἔδωκε δόματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, *he gave Gifts unto Men*, declaring the Effect and Fruits of what *David* had prophesied, for that *Christ* received Gifts, that he might bestow them upon Men. And because the Apostle describes that Matter as already brought to effect, now that Churches were every where settled through the World, he therefore cautiously says, *gave*, and not *received*.

Nº. xvi. Moreover, sometimes a saying seems to be quoted out of the Old Testament in the New against the Design of the Author, and yet in reality there is no Contradiction betwixt the two Places. To this is applicable the *Jewish Canon*, לא בא הכתוב לסתום אלא לפרש *The Scripture came not for Contradiction, but for Exposition.* See ² *Surenbuius*. For since one and the same Spirit dictated to, inspir'd and influenc'd holy Men in compiling the Scripture, and since *He is not a God of Confusion*, and Inconstancy, or contrary to himself, *1 Cor. xiv. 33. but the Spirit of Truth, leading us into all Truth*; hence it follows, that none of the Scripture Oracles can contradict or oppose one another. We ought therefore to seek out for a Method of Reconcilement, and to look up to the Father of Lights for it, that we may be enabled to compose those seeming Contradictions, according to the Intention of the Holy Ghost. Thus in *Matt. xiii. 35.* that is said to

have been fulfilled in the Parables of *Christ*, which *Psal.* lxxviii. 2. the *Psalmist* speaks of himself, and as introductory to the Recital of the ancient History of his own Nation and Family. But in this Place is intimated not so much the Accomplishment of a Prophecy, as an Accommodation of the Words of *David*, to the same Manner of Instruction used by *Christ* the Son of *David*; and so the Old Testament is sometimes said to be fulfilled in the New, in as much as something like the other is done in the New. Again, *Rom.* xiv. 11. *As I live saith the Lord, every Knee shall bow to me*, is referr'd to *Christ*, which notwithstanding *Isa.* xlv. 23. seems to respect the Deliverance of the *Jews* from their Captivity: But although the first Part of the Chapter might promise this Deliverance to be effected by *Cyrus*, yet the latter Part of it has a manifest View to *Christ*, and according to the Interpretation of *St. Paul*, is to be understood of him, *Phil.* ii. 10. so that this Example belongs not to our present Head. Moreover, *St. James* ii. 23. produces the Example of *Abraham*, and the Testimony taken from *Gen.* xv. 6. to make good his Demonstration, that we are justified by Works; and *St. Paul*, *Rom.* iv. 3. alleges the same Text to prove Justification by Faith. Yet both of them very pertinently and appositely make use of the same Instance of *Abraham*: *St. Paul* in setting forth the Act of Justification, which excludes all Works; *St. James* in pointing out the Person justified, as declaring and manifesting to the World his Faith by his Works; so that there is no Contradiction between them. Hither also belongs *Matth.* ii. 15. *Out of Egypt have I called my Son*, where that is said to be fulfilled in *Christ*, which yet in *Hos.* xi. 1. is undoubtedly affirmed of the People of *Israel*. But here we must observe, that there are prophetic

tical Sayings, which admit of a double Completion; one literal in the Type, another mystical in the Antitype: As then the Command of God, *that a Bone should not be broken*, was fulfilled typically in the Paschal Lamb, antotypically in *Christ*, John xix. 36. so likewise the calling out of *Egypt*, had its literal and typical Accomplishment in *Israel*, which was mystically and antotypically fulfilled in *Christ*; which ^a *Spanheim* (who largely defends this Interpretation) elegantly illustrates by a Similitude taken from the throwing of *Jonathan's Arrows*, 1 Sam. xx. 36. But if you deny that disobedient *Israel* could be a Type of *Christ*, another Interpretation is easily given, which applies the former Words of the Prophet to *Israel*, the latter to *Christ*, in this Manner: Although *Israel* was a Child, (yea, a disobedient and froward one, as the Word נַבִּי נַבִּי is taken *Isai.* iii. 4, 5. *lxv.* 20. *Prov.* i. 4. *xxii.* 15. *Eccles.* x. 16, &c.) yet I have loved him, and for his Advantage and Benefit I have called my Son out of *Egypt*, who is to instruct and lead him in the right Way, yea, and to save him by the Shedding of his Blood, and by his Death. Which Interpretation ^b *Calovius*, *Andr. Rivetus*, *Coccejus* and others maintain.

Nº. xvii. Sometimes only a Word or two are cited out of a whole Verse, for Proof of a Thing; as in *Mark* xv. 28. only three Words are quoted out of the Middle of the 12th Verse of the liii Chapter of *Isaiab*, μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη, *he was numbred with the Transgressors*. In *John* xiii. 18. the last Words of the 10th Verse of the xli *Psal*m are cited. *John* xv. 25. ἐμίσησαν δωρεάν, *they hated me without a Cause*, from *Psal.* lxix. In *John* xix. 28.

^a P. 1. Dub. Evangel. 62—71. p. 474, &c. in h. l. Osee.

^b Comment.

but

but one Word, $\delta\iota\psi\omega$, *I thirst*, is cited by *Jesus* from *Psal.* lxix. 22.

Nº. xviii. Sometimes in Quotations the Words cited are not the only ones referred to, but we are to look both to what goes before and after; and so the Readers are directed, as by an *Et cætera*, to the whole Context. This is most evident, by comparing *Matth.* iii. 3. and *Mark* i. 3. with *Luke* iii. 4, &c. where the first two cite only the third Verse of the xl Chapter of *Isaiab*, but *St. Luke* adds the fourth and fifth Verses, thereby shewing us, that the whole Context of *Isaiab* ought to be brought in there. This Observation I owe to *Dorscheus*, who makes it in his Comment upon *Luke* iii. 4. p. 734. assuring us withal, that it contributes much to the Explication of that perplexed Place, *Acts* xiii. 33. for *Christ* was not made the Son of God by his Resurrection, as the *Socinians* plead, and pretend to demonstrate from this Place, but these Words are only ראש פסוקים *the Beginning of the rest of the Verses*, which relate to that Purpose, and they refer us to the whole Context of the second *Psal*m, about the Kingdom and Exaltation of *Christ*, instructing us, that he who by Eternal Generation from the Father, is the Son of God, could not but be raised from the Dead by the Father, that he might powerfully protect his Kingdom, and bear absolute Rule over his Enemies. Hence it is that when by his Resurrection, $\Theta\epsilon\omega\delta\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \upsilon\pi\omicron\varsigma\ \Theta\epsilon\acute{\omega}\ \epsilon\upsilon\ \delta\upsilon\alpha\mu\epsilon\iota$, *He was declared the Son of God with Power*; this was a strong Demonstration to Men, that *Christ* is the Eternal Son of God, begotten of the Essence of his Father, *Rom.* i. 4. ^c *Surenbusius* furnishes us with many more Examples to this Purpose.

^c Lib. i. Th. 8. & 10. p. 47, &c.

IV. Next (*Fourthly*) *As to the Sense, Drift, and Design of a Citation*, observe N^o. xix. That a Quotation of a Prophecy of the Old Testament, is sometimes given according to the literal and native Meaning and Intent of the Word, according to which it was directed to some Event of the New Testament. Such as are the Testimonies about the Nativity of *Christ*, *Isaiah* vii. 14. *Matth.* i. 22. His Entrance into the City, *Zach.* ix. 9. *Matth.* xxi. 5. His Passion, *Psal.* xxii. 19. *John* xix. 24. His Resurrection, *Psal.* xvi. 8. *Acts* ii. 25. His Ascension, *Psal.* lxxviii. 18. *Eph.* iv. 8. His Sitting at the Right Hand of the Father, *Psal.* cx. 1. *Heb.* i. 13, &c. Sometimes a Prophecy is quoted only in the way of Accommodation, which is either of a general Doctrine to a particular Subject, (as for Example, what Things are foretold concerning the Destruction of the *Jews* who were *Christ's* Enemies, *Psal.* lxxix. 25. are applied by *St. Peter* to the Death of *Judas* the Traytor, *Acts* i. 20.) or of a special Saying about one Thing, to another Thing like to it, as the Words of *Isai.* vi. 9. about the hard-heartedness of *Isaiah's* Hearers are said to be fulfilled in the Hearers of those different Teachers, who lived in different Times, *Matt.* xiii. 14. *Acts* xxviii. 26. *Rom.* xi. 8. as also what Things *Isai.* xxix. 13. spoke about the *Jews* of his Age, are by *Christ* transferr'd to his own Hearers, as foretold of them *Matth.* xv. 7. or finally some special Saying concerning one Thing, may for some particular Reason be applied to some other Matter, foreign and different from it; as in *2 Cor.* viii. 15. the Apostle gives both Light and Strength to his Exhortation about relieving the Poor out of the Abundance of the Wealthy, by referring to the History of the *Manna* [*Exod.* xvi. 18.] because the Will of God is the same both as to supporting

ing the Church, and supporting the Poor. Or sometimes a special Saying may be transferr'd to a general Subject, as when *St. Paul*, 1 *Cor.* i. 19. applies the Words of *Isai.* xxix. 14. which had a particular Reference to the *Jews*, to all them who esteem'd the Preaching of the Cross Foolishness, since the like Crimes call for the like Punishment. So again, 1 *Cor.* xiv. 21. the particular Words of *Isai.* xxviii. 11. which are meant of the *Jews*, he applies to his general Purpose, to prove that Tongues are given by him for a Sign to Unbelievers. As also what Things are spoken *Levit.* xi. 44. and xix. 2. about the ceremonial Sanctity of the *Jews*, *St. Peter*, 1 *Epist.* i. 16. applies to the moral Holiness of godly Men in general.

Nº. xx. Sometimes a Prophecy is cited, not so much upon Account of the Words themselves, as for the Conclusion following from them, or because of the Argument which may be drawn from the whole Passage: As when *St. Matth.* viii. 17. affirms, that in the miraculous Cures performed by *Christ*, was fulfilled, that which *Isa.* liii. 4. foretold about the Expiation of our Sins. *Christ* himself taught us this by his Method of Dispute against the *Sadducees*, *Matth.* xxii. 31. &c. in which for proving the Resurrection of the Dead, he quotes a Testimony from *Exod.* iii. 6. which intimates no such thing, in the bare Words, yet is pertinently and forcibly apply'd to the Argument in Hand by our Saviour: And thus the Words of *Psalms* lxxxix. 6. are alledged by our Lord himself in Proof of the Divinity of the *Messiah*, not upon Account of their express meaning, but with a View to the Argument to be formed from them, *John* x. 34.

Nº. xxi. Sometimes one and the same Prediction of the Old Testament, is applied to different

ferent Purposes, by different Writers of the New Testament, and yet the Sense of the Prophecy still remains the same, because the Citations are not made with the same View, nor after the same Manner: As for Example, the Text of *Psal. ex. 1.* is applied in *Matt. xxii. 44.* to confound the *Pharisees*, and in *Acts ii. 34.* for proving *Christ's* Ascension into Heaven; and *Heb. i. 3.* it is applied to confirm the Union of the divine Majesty with the humane Nature of *Christ*. The Words of *Gen. xv. 6.* are quoted by *St. Paul*, *Rom. iv. 3.* to declare our Justification by Faith, and by *James ii. 23.* to inform us, how necessary Works proceeding from Faith, are to one that is justified, in order to prove him a true *Christian*: The Case is the same as to the Justification of *Rahab*, which *St. James ii. 25.* quotes to one purpose, *St. Paul* to another, *Heb. xi. 31.* Consult upon this Subject *Surenhusius* *.

Now, (*Fifthly*,) *As to the Form of Quoting*, we must observe N^o. *xxii.* That a Quotation is sometimes indefinite, no Writer nor Book being mention'd, as *Rom. xv. 10.* *And again it saith*, viz. the Scripture, *Eph. iv. 8.* *wherefore he saith*, *Heb. viii. 8.* *for finding Fault with them, He saith also, it is written*, *Matth. iv. 4, 7, 10.* *Acts xxiii. 5, &c.* *Have ye not read*, *Matth. xii. 3. xix. 4. xxi. 16.* Finally, *learn ye what that meaneth*, *Matth. ix. 13. and xii. 7.* But sometimes God himself, or his holy Spirit is introduced, speaking: *Acts xiii. 47.* *2 Corinth. vi. 2.* *Matth. ii. 15.* *Acts xxviii. 25.* Or some Writer of the Old Testament, either indefinitely, when he is not nam'd, *Heb. ii. 6. x. 30.* Or by a determinate Name, as *John xii. 38, 39.* *Isaiah*; *Matth. iii. 3.* *Acts ii. 29.* *David*, &c. is named. But when, *Acts xiii.*

* L. 1. Th. 41. p. 27. & L. 2. Th. 13, 14. p. 51, &c.

40. ἐν τοῖς προφήταις, in the Prophets, the Citation runs in the plural Number, which is read but in one of the Prophets, *Habb. i. 5.* οἱ προφῆται, the Prophets, are taken for the whole Volume of the Prophets, called by the Jews תריסר Tresar, the twelve; by the Greeks δωδεκαπρόφητων, the twelve Prophets. Again, when *Matth. xix. 5.* Christ ascribes to God the Words which are attributed to Adam in *Genesis*, he intimates to us both the Authors of that Oracle, first the Principal, by whose Motion and Inspiration Adam spoke that Sentence, and next the ministerial Author, by whose Mouth and Words God did speak.

VI. Finally (Sixthly) As to the Likeness and Affinity of Citations, we ought to observe N^o. xxiii. That sometimes the Speakers or Writers of the New Testament, use Forms of Speech, and a Phraseology taken from the Old Testament, yet without quoting any Testimony: As for Example, Mary in her Hymn, *Luke i. 46,* &c. borrows her Manner of speaking from *Isa. lxi. 10.* *Psal. xxxiii. 10.* *xxxiv. 2.* *Isa. xxiv. 19.* *Zechariah* also, *Luke i. 68,* &c. composes his Song from *Psal. cxxxii. 17.* *Mal. iv. 5.* *Zech. iii. 15,* &c. *Simeon* hath his from *Isa. xlix.* *Luke ii. 29,* &c. So *St. Peter*, in his first Epistle i. 24. expresseth himself agreeably to *Isa. xl. 6.* In the vii Chapter of *St. John* 37th Verse, *Christ* himself speaks after the same Manner with *Isa. lv. 1.*

N^o. xxiv. Sometimes in the New Testament there is a bare Allusion made to Facts and Speeches of the Old Testament, which is very frequent in the *Revelations*. So in Chapter vi. 16. there is an Allusion to *Isa. ii. 19.* *Rev. xi. 5.* alludes to *Jer. v. 14.* as also to the History of *Moses*, *Numb. xvi. 35.* and to that of *Elias* 2 *Kings i. 9.* *Rev. xi. 6.* to the historical Account 1 *Kings xvii.* And the Plague sent upon *Egypt*, *Exod. iv.*
Again,

Again, *Rev.* xvi. 21. alludes to *Exod.* ix. 24. *Josh.* x. 11, &c. And perhaps we may interpret *Matth.* xiii. 35. this way. To this Head belongs the *Jewish* Form of Speech ואל ויה רמו הכחב
And to this the Scripture alludes, which ^d *Surenhusius* explains and illustrates by Examples.

If the foregoing Considerations appear rather too Prolix, yet they are not foreign to the Point in Hand: And so I have not scrupled the Pains of laying them together, because they will furnish us with Heads of Solution proper to every Place objected by our Author and *Cappellus*, and will withal shew us the Unconclusiveness of the Argument drawn from Citations of that Kind against the Integrity of the *Hebrew* Text. For it is evident by all these Instances, that the Holy Ghost did not intend every where in the New Testament, to abide by the very Words which were used in the Old, but that sometimes it was contrary to his Design to do it; so far from any Shadow of Reason is there to argue for the Corruption of the *Hebrew* Copy, from any Difference between the Text cited and its Original. Which is further manifest from those Places, which are more than once recited in the New Testament, but the Expressions designedly changed. For Example, from *Matth.* iii. 3. *Mark* i. 3. *Luke* iii. 4. compar'd with *John* i. 23. As also, *Matth.* xiii. 14. compar'd with *John* xii. 40. with *Acts* xxviii. 26. And again, with *Rom.* xi. 8. in all which Places, the same Prophecy is cited from *Isa.* vi. 10. but in each of them exprest in different Words. If our Adversary shall from hence argue that the Original is corrupted, let him declare which of these Citations exactly represents it, and which we are to take to correct it by?

For suppose that one only, *Christ* for Instance, hath rightly express'd the Words of *Isaiab* in *St. Matthew*, it necessarily follows that *St. John*, *St. Luke*, and *St. Paul* used corrupt *Hebrew* Copies, and that even at that Time the *Hebrew* Copies were not pure and correct, long before that solemn Corruption which *Mr. Whiston* pretends. But to remove all doubt, we shall in a very few Words, reduce those Quotations controverted by our Antagonist, each of them to its proper Class.

OBJ. I. Page 88. " Here he insists upon *Matth.*
 " ii. 15. *Out of Egypt have I called my Son.* *Mr.*
 " *Whiston* denies that these Words were taken
 " from *Hos. xi. 1.* First, because *Hosea* treats of
 " the bringing the Children of *Israel* out of the
 " Land of *Egypt*: But the Deliverance of *Israel*
 " from *Egypt*, no way proves, that in succeeding
 " Ages the *Messiah* should be call'd out of
 " *Egypt* in the Days of *Herod*, or *Archelaus*. Secondly,
 " the Words of *Hosea* are not read in the
 " LXX as in *St. Matthew*, who has it, τὸν υἱόν
 " μου, *My Son*, but with Them they stand thus:
 " ἐξ Ἀιγύπτου μετεκάλεσα τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶ, *I called his*
 " *Children out of Egypt.* Thirdly, *Jonathan's Targum*
 " agrees with this *Greek Version.* Fourthly,
 " the subsequent Words of *Hosea* are also put in
 " the plural Number, and so far they confirm
 " the *Greek* reading against the modern *Hebrew.*
 " Hence he concludes, both that those Words of
 " *Hosea* were in ancient Times read in the *Hebrew*,
 " as at this Day they are read in the *Greek*,
 " and also that they are not the same with those
 " which *St. Matthew* cites. Then our Antagonist
 " conjectures, that *St. Matthew* cites the
 " Words of God in *Isa. xli. 8, 9.* But thou *Israel*
 " art my *Servant*, *Jacob* whom I have chosen,
 " the Seed of *Abraham* my Friend: Whom I have
 " taken

“ taken from the Ends of the Earth, and out of
 “ Egypt, (as Mr. *Whiston* reads it, but in the O-
 “ riginal we have it, ממצרים קראתיך from the
 “ choice Men thereof: Or as others render it,
 “ and from the Ends of it) I have called thee (The
 “ I.XX, καὶ ἐκ τῶν σκοπιῶν αὐτῆς ἐκάλεσά σε, and
 “ from the Ends of it I have called thee) and I said
 “ to thee: Thou art my Servant, I have chosen thee,
 “ and I have not rejected thee.

ANSW. What becomes of your Fidelity, good Mr. *Whiston*? Was it fair, thus to presume, against the reading of all Copies, against the Testimony of all Versions, the *Septuagint* especially (whose Authority you pretend to hold in such Reverence) to corrupt the original Text, to substitute one Word for another, to impose upon the unlearned, who can neither consult nor compare the Original, and to invent a Reading according to your own Fancy, and all this only to make the Text answer to your own Hypothesis? Name me any one Copy where you have read ממצרים *Memitzrayem*, out of Egypt: Or let me know of any one Translation, which hath given us this reading. Or is מאצילה *Maatzeleba* the very same as out of Egypt? It is a Sign of a desperate Cause, to falsify authentick Instruments, or by altering the Words to shape them to such a Sense as the Party has a Mind to; not to mention that you wound yourself with your own Weapons. For you deny that the Words of St. *Matthew* are taken out of *Hosea*, because the Prophet speaks of *Israel*, and St. *Matthew* of *Christ*. But pray tell me plainly, of whom are the Words of *Isaiab* spoken? Are they not of *Israel*? Therefore they agree no more to *Christ*, than what we read in *Hosea*. Since then the Words of *Isaiab* are incongruously apply'd here, it most evidently appears, that the Words are taken

from no where else but out of *Hosea*; and as to the Manner how, and with what Connection of Argument they belong to *Christ*, we have before intimated N^o. xvi. p. 116. Moreover, as to the Words of *Isaiab*, in vain may we seek after any calling out of *Egypt*, even as to the Sense (if you were to change the reading) as *Vitringa* shews upon this Place of *Isaiab*. But the reading however is the main Thing we were upon.

OBJ. II. Page 93. " He objects, that ^e *Christ* himself, and also ^f *St. Paul*, and the *Apostolical Constitutions*, do all quote the Words of *Genesis* against Polygamy, thus expressing them; " *and they two shall be one Flesh*, always adding " the Word *two*, which yet is wanting in the *Hebrew* Text, *Gen. ii. 24*. But *Christ's* Words " next following, are an Argument that it was " read in the old *Hebrew* Copy, *wherefore they are* " *no more two, but one Flesh*; and the *Samaritan* " *Copy*, as also the *Septuagint* and the *Syriack* *Version*, have it so.

ANSW. This Example is reducible to the Observation made above at N^o. xiii. p. 110. neither is there any Difficulty in it. For what is understood in *Moses*, from the Context and the whole History, *Christ* supplies. There was no Occasion to add the Word *two*, at a time when there were only two in all the World, and more could not become one Flesh. Therefore our Saviour reducing the Law back to the primitive Institution of Marriage, does from the Thing itself, the History, and the Circumstances, supply that Word, which the Sense of *Moses's* Words naturally suggested. For what else does it import; *The Man shall cleave to his Wife, and they shall be one Flesh*;

^e *Matth. xix. 5, 6. Mark x. 7, 8. f 1 Cor. vi. 16. and Eph. v. 31.*

than if he had said, *Two shall become one Flesh, &c.* Our Saviour therefore in his Copy, did not read this Word as being extant in *Moses*, but for making the Thing more perspicuous, he directly added it, as naturally flowing from the Sense of the Words of *Moses*.

OBJ. III. Page 93. " Next he alledges *Matth.* xxvii. 9, 10. where *Jeremiab* is thought to be cited in Place of *Zechariah*. Here Mr. *Whiston* pleads, that St. *Matthew* did rightly name *Jeremiab*, because this and other Prophecies, which are now read in *Zechariah*, in ancient Times had their native Place in *Jeremiab*, but that they were afterwards with the greatest Violence intruded into the Text of *Zechariah*. Whence *Josephus Mede* hath long ago observed, that there are several other Prophecies to be seen in *Zechariah*, which would much more exactly agree with the Times of *Jeremiab*. Yea the ^h *Apostolick Constitutions* alledge a Text in the Name of *Jeremiab*, which is now to be seen only in *Zechariah*. From whence at length our Adversary concludes, that this Verse is at this Day misplaced in *Zechariah*, which really belongs to *Jeremiab*, and which was in the Book of *Jeremiab* in the first Century.

ANSW. We have declared our Opinion upon this Quotation at N^o. viii. p. 107. from which we shall not recede upon Mr. *Whiston's* trifling Pretences. For the Commentaries upon this Place have fully shewn us, how appositely this Verse agrees with the Context of *Zechariah*; neither could our sophistical Reasoner give any Proof to convince us, that this Verse in *Zechariah* is foreign or intruded. And the Authority of the *Apostolical Constitutions* is not considerable enough to re-

^g Tom. ii. Opp. p. 963, 1022.

^h Lib 2. c. 53 p. 258.

move Passages of Scripture out of their proper Place, or to demonstrate to us what was the Order of Texts in the first Century. That Author, whoever he was, might mistake in assigning those Words of the viii Chap. 17th Verse of *Zechariah* to *Jeremiah*: And it does not from thence follow, that the Prophecies of both those Prophets are intermixed and confounded with one another; and that many of them which are found in the Book of *Zechariah*, do of Right belong to *Jeremiah*. It was incumbent upon him to prove this, from the Coherence and Connection of the Passages, if he intended to give but so much as any Colour to the Calumny.

OBJ. IV. Page 95. " That Place of *St. Luke*,
 " [Chap. iv. 16—19.] read by *Christ* out of the
 " lxi of *Isaiab*, first and second Verses, is not
 " read so exactly and fully, either in the *Hebrew* or
 " *Greek* Copy of the LXX, as in *St. Luke*, and
 " from thence it seems to have suffer'd some Al-
 " teration after the first Century.

ANSW. Hereto again belongs the Observation at N^o. xiii. p. 111. to which we have referred this Text. But here Mr. *Whiston* plays the Sophister, in tempting to persuade us, that *Christ* read the Prophecy of *Isaiab* in the same Words, and in the same Language, in which *St. Luke* relates it. But he rather used the *Hebrew* Words before the Company, which *St. Luke* rendering into *Greek*, by the Direction of God's Spirit, explain'd one or two of them.

OBJ. V. Page 97. " The Heaven is said to
 " have been shut up three Years and six Months
 " in the Time of *Elias*: *Luke* iv. 25. *James* v. 17.
 " which Computation of Time is not to be found
 " either in the *Hebrew*, or *Greek* Copy of the
 " LXX.

ANSW.

ANSW. What we have said in our Observations at the N^o. xi. p. 109. may suffice for this Article.

OBJ. VI. Page 97. " Our Saviour is often in
 " the Old Testament styled the Just one, as in
 " *Matth.* xxvii. 19—24. *Acts* iii. 14. vii. 52.
 " xxii. 14. *James* v. 6. 1 *John* ii. 1. This his e-
 " minent Character is doubtless taken from *Isai.*
 " xli. 2. but the *Jews* have alter'd the Place, so that
 " where it should be read, *who raised up the Just*
 " or *Righteous Man from the East*, in our Days
 " they read it, *who raised up Justice or Righteous-*
 " *ness from the East*. And besides ¹*Philo* plainly
 " tells us, that these Words describe τινα δίκαιον
 " ἀνδρα, a certain just Man.

ANSW. This professed Enemy of the original Text, here argues with great Acuteness and Subtily, as thus: *Christ* is oftentimes in the New Testament called the *just*; therefore some Prophecy of the Old Testament, is quoted, which expressly mentions him under that Character: Therefore *Isa.* xli. 2. precisely, is quoted: Therefore in that Text, in place of צדק *Tzadak*, *Righteousness*, ought to be read צדיק *Tzadik*, *Righteous*; therefore the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Text are corrupted. A fine Chain of Reasoning, such as all vain Wranglers may think worth their learning of *Mr. Whiston*: For by the Help of this, they may make *quidlibet ex quolibet*, may prove any Thing from any Thing, and may be able to wrest the Words of Laws and original Records, to whatever Sense they have a mind to. Those disjointed Reasonings hang so loosely together, that they betray their own Weakness at once. Our Saviour is indeed called, both in the Abstract, *Righteousness*, *Jer.* xxiii. 6. xxxiii. 16. as also in the Concrete,

ⁱ De Decalogo, p. 749.

Righteous, Isa. xlv. 21. liii. 11. Yet thence does it not follow, that those Texts are directly quoted in the New Testament, where the Son of God is called *Righteous*. Hitherto belongs what we observed at N^o. xxiii. p. 122. Much less may we say that in these Places is cited Isa. xli. 2. which Prophecy many Interpreters do not apply to *Christ* at all, but they understand it either of *Abraham*, with *Calovius*; or of *Cyrus*, with *Varenius*, and with the above-mention'd *Vitranga* who comes last of all, and whom it will be very proper to consult upon this Text. But suppose with *Schmidius*, that the Prophet speaks of *Christ*, yet there is no Necessity for changing the Word צדק *Tzadak*, *Righteousness*, into צדיק *Tzadik*, *Righteous*; although *Jerom*, and after him *Luther*, render'd it in the Concrete, Both according to the Liberty they were pleas'd to take in translating. But from thence to conclude that the primitive Copies are corrupted, is nothing else but an evident Sign and Token of a Mind possess'd with Prejudice against the Original.

OBJ. VII. Page 99. " In the viii Chapter of St. *John*, at the fifth Verse, the *Jews* say, that *Moses* commanded to stone the Adulterers, which Assertion our Saviour's Answer in the seventh Verse confirms. This Punishment then, although in this Age it is not extant in the *Hebrew*, nor *Samaritan Pentateuch*, nor in the *Septuagint*, nor *Iosephus*, yet that in ancient Times it was prescribed, and in the Time of *Christ* was read in the Law, besides the Place quoted, is acknowledged also by the ^k *Apostolical Constitutions*.

ANSW. Interpreters differ about the Punishment of the Adulterers, because *Moses*, Levit. xx. 10.

^k Lib. 6. cap. 28. p. 357.

and *Deut. xxii. 22.* had indeed appointed a capital Punishment indefinitely to both the Adulterer and Adulteress, but had not assign'd them any particular kind of Death. The *Jewish* Rabbies agree that it was Strangling; but since severer Punishments were to be inflicted upon growing Crimes, *Grotius* thinks that Adulteries becoming frequent at that time, used to be punished by stoning. *Henr. Hammond* is of Opinion, that Stoning only took Place, when the Adulteress was taken in the very Act, as in the fourth Verse of this Chapter. ¹*Selden* understands it of a betroth'd, not a married Wife, whom *Moses* expressly appoints to be punish'd by being stoned to Death. With him agrees ^m*Franc. Burman.* ⁿ*Wagenfeilius* that famous Interpreter of the *Jewish* Antiquities and Laws insinuates, that Stoning is declared by *Moses* in *Deut. xxii. 22.* compared with the 24th Verse. And this might be confirm'd from *Ezek. xvi. 38—40.* where Stoning is said to be the Judgment of the Adulteress. However this be, here we have the Words of the *Scribes* and *Pharisees*, quoting *Moses* to that Sense in which they understood and explain'd his Words. Hence it may be clearly perceived, that at that Time the Practice of the *Jewish* Courts of Justice was to stone Adulteresses. *Christ* in his Answer to them, does not say that he read in his Copy, that the Punishment by Stoning was expressly appointed by *Moses* to Adulteresses, but disputing with them *ad hominem*, upon their Principles, and desirous to confound the Prosecutors, he retorts the same Sentence upon Them, which they had pronounced against the Woman; leaving it in Suspence, and not determining, whether the Punishment of

¹ Uxor Ebr. Lib. 13 cap. 11. ^m Ad *Lev. xx. 10.* ⁿ Ad סוטה *Sotah*, cap. 1. *Mischn. 5. Annot. 2. p. 31, &c.*

Stoning for this Crime, took its Rise from the Decision of *Moses*, or from the then present Practice of their Courts. Upon which Consideration, our Saviour's Discourse argues no Omission in the Copy of the Law; and much less can the pretended *Apostolick Constitutions*, which in the Place already cited follow *Moses* exactly, neither do they determine any kind of Death. For thus they say; Ἐάν τις γυναῖκα ὑπανδρον μίανη, σπορλεῖναι ἀμφοτέρους· ἀνομίαν ἐποίησαν, ἐνοχοὶ εἰσιν, σποθανέτωσαν. *If any Man shall defile a married Woman, put both of them to Death; they have committed Iniquity, they are guilty, let them die.* Which Words Mr. *Whiston* hath sily omitted, quoting those only which went before, about the Sin of unnatural Uncleannefs being punished by stoning to Death, and which have nothing to do with what we are now upon: By this Example again shewing us, with what Sincerity he produces his Vouchers. All I shall add is, transiently to observe, that since some deny this whole Portion of Scripture any way to belong to St. *John*, thinking that it hath been but lately intruded into his Gospel, *Selden* already mention'd hath recited their Reasons, and ° *Franc. Gomarus* hath industriously vindicated it, as belonging to St. *John*, and solidly proved its Authenticity.

OBJ. VIII. P. 100. “ St. *Stephen* [Acts vii. 43.]
 “ cites these Words: *And I will carry you away*
 “ *beyond Babylon*, which *Amos* v. 27. in the *He-*
 “ *brew*, and the *Septuagint* have, *Therefore will*
 “ *I cause you to go into Captivity beyond Damas-*
 “ *cus*: But certainly St. *Stephen* was right in his
 “ Citation; whatever the present reading may
 “ be.

° Tom. i. Opp. fol. 415, &c.

ANSW.

ANSW. *Hugo Grotius* happily reconciles this Difficulty, for that here *Amos* signified more than he directly said. For *Affyria* and *Media*, which are beyond *Babylon*, are much more beyond *Damascus*. Therefore the Sense is conveniently expressed by *St. Stephen*, although there is a Change of the Words. For the *Israelites* or ten Tribes, who are here spoken of, were not only transported beyond *Syria*, the Metropolis of which is *Damascus*, but they were also carried away beyond *Babylon* into *Persia* and *Caspia*, as appears from *Ezra* viii. 17. Therefore *St. Stephen* names more distinctly how far they should be carried Captive: *Amos* hints it more confusedly and indefinitely, yet Both of them agreeing upon the Quarter they were to go to. *P Herm. Witsius* favouring the same Opinion, rightly says: “ *St. Stephen* quoting that Prophecy, *Acts* vii. 43. says “ *beyond Babylon*, instead of *beyond Damascus*, in “ order to explain the Matter. In this Sense: “ Ye shall be transported, not only beyond the “ Confines of your native Country, and the “ Boundaries of your pleasant Fields, such as is “ the City of *Damascus*, being upon the Border “ of the Holy Land, but even beyond *Babylon*, “ into much more remote Places, almost beyond “ the Knowledge of your Country, and beyond “ Hope to return. *Amos* had in his Time a “ particular Reason for saying, *beyond Damascus*: “ And *St. Stephen* had his Reasons for his interpreting it *beyond Babylon*. Before the Time of “ *Amos*, *Hazael* King of *Damascus* had greatly distressed the Land of the ten Tribes, and having “ slain some of them, as is probable, he carried “ off others Captives into *Syria*, 2 *King*. x. 32, 33. “ Therefore the Prophet goes on to denounce a

“ greater Calamity to them, for in a short Time
 “ they should be transported much further than
 “ *Damascus*. And since he did not determine how
 “ far, *St. Stephen* specifies it: Namely, beyond *Ba-*
 “ *bylon*, into the Confines of *Media*. The Truth of
 “ which has been confirmed by the Event, &c.

OBJ. IX. Page 101. “ *St. Paul* in *Gal. iii. 10.*
 “ quotes an Oracle from the *Mosaick Law*, *Deut.*
 “ *xxvii. 26.* *It is written; cursed is every one who*
 “ *continueth not in all things, that are written in*
 “ *the Book of the Law to do them.* Those Words
 “ *In all Things*, have their Emphasis here, and
 “ on them in part the Force of the Apostle’s
 “ reasoning depends; and they being read in the
 “ *Septuagint* and *Samaritan Copy*, give us ground
 “ to suspect, that the *Hebrew Text*, in which
 “ those Words are wanting, is corrupted.” Of
 this Opinion also was ⁹ *St. Jerom.*

ANSW. Our Adversary recites *Jerom*’s Words
 mutilated and altogether imperfect, which at full
 length are thus express’d: “ From which (*viz.*
 “ from the Translations of the *LXX*, *Aquila*,
 “ *Symmachus*, and *Theodotion*, which he had quo-
 “ ted upon this Point in the said Order, and
 “ Word for Word) we understand, that the A-
 “ postle, as on other Occasions, rather recites
 “ the Sense than the Words of the Quotation;
 “ and we are not sure, whether the *LXX* Inter-
 “ preters might have added *every Man*, and in
 “ *all Things*, or whether it was in the old *Hebrew*
 “ *Copy*, and afterwards left out by the *Jews*.
 “ But this latter I am the more inclinable to su-
 “ spect, because the Words, *every Man*, and in
 “ *all Things*, being necessary for compleating his
 “ Sense, *that whosoever are under the Works of*
 “ *the Law, are under the Curse*, the Apostle

⁹ Comment. in h. l.

“ skilful in the *Hebrew*, and very learned in the
 “ Law, would never have made use of, unless
 “ he had found them in the *Hebrew Copies* :
 “ Wherefore reading over the *Samaritan Hebrew*
 “ Bible, I found that it was written כֹּל *Kol*,
 “ which is interpreted *all*, or *in all*, and that the
 “ same is agreeable to the *LXX Interpreters*. In
 “ vain therefore did the *Jews* strike it out, that
 “ they might not seem to be under the Curse
 “ if they could not fulfil all Things which
 “ are written; when the ancients Characters e-
 “ ven of another Nation, assure us, that it was
 “ so written.” And therefore it was ill done of
 Mr. *Whiston*, contenting himself with the quoting
 of the latter Part, to omit the former, which
 plainly teaches us, that although *Jerom* might
 suspect that the *Jews* had corrupted the Text,
 yet in this he passes his Judgment very doubtful-
 ly, having deliver’d his Opinion more justly in
 the preceding Part of his Discourse, that the A-
 postle here, as is usual with him in other Texts,
 had given the Sense rather than the Words of
 the Testimony cited; which is parallel to what
 we observ’d at N^o. xiii. p. 110. But whatever
Jerom’s Opinion may have been, according to which
 we are neither to stand nor fall, the Thing it
 self shews, that there is nothing which can justly
 be suppos’d wanting in the Words of *Moses*; which
 the Apostle quoting in such a Manner as the
 Scope of his Argument, and the Sense of the
 Oracle requir’d, express’d more plainly by the
 Addition of one or two Words. *Moses* had said
 in the Beginning of the Execrations, וְכָל אִישׁ אֲרֻרָא *Arrur Haesh*, Cursed is the Man, which
 is the same with the Apostolical Saying, ὃς πάντες ἀρῶν *arōn*, cursed is every one: And since this was
 to be repeated through every Verse, St. *Paul*,
 citing the 26th Verse apart and without the Con-
 text,

text, adds *ἅς*, every one, because *Moses* intended so to be understood. Moreover, when he proceeds from particular *Anathemas*, to an universal or general one, and sums up all the Transgressions of the Law, as it were under one common Head, it was enough for *Moses* to have said *אֵת רְבוּ הַחֻדוֹת הַזֵּאת*, because, *the Words of this Law*, entirely comprehended all the several Branches of Man's Duty. But the Apostle, that the Words of *Moses* might upon the first Sight of them appear in their full Force of Argument, seasonably added, *ἐν ᾧ ἅσι τοῖς γέγραμμένοις*, in all Things which are written; instructing us in the same Thing, which *Moses* had told us in fewer Words. And when he observ'd that the LXX had rightly rendred the Sense of *Moses*, he copied after them, according to what we told you at No. xiv. p. 112.

OBJ. X. Page 102. " St. Paul also quotes these
 " Words from the *Psalms*, Eph. iv. 8. *Psal.* lxxviii.
 " 19. *Wherefore he saith, when he ascended on*
 " *high, he led Captivity captive, and gave Gifts*
 " *unto Men.* Where what is here cited, as the
 " Apostle's Purpose requir'd, *gave Gifts unto Men,*
 " is both in the *Hebrew* and *Septuagint*, *received*
 " *Gifts in Man, or in a Man,* with no clear Sense
 " at all. Now even in this Case we have remarkable
 " Attestations to the Apostle's Quotation as
 " of old, both in the *Hebrew* and *Greek*; and this
 " from the *Chaldee Paraphrast*, and the ancient
 " *Syriack* Version, both made according to the
 " *Hebrew*; the *Roman*, *Arabick*, and *Ethiopic*
 " *Psalters*, with † *Justin Martyr's* two Citations,
 " all made from the *Greek*; which have the Text
 " as the Apostle quotes it. And this is the more
 " fit to be observ'd, of the *Syriack* Version es-

† Dialog. cum Tryphone, p. 258. & 315.

pecially,

“ pecially, because as the very learned Dr. Pri-
 “ *deaux* has inform’d us, this Text thus rendred
 “ is particularly remark’d by the *Syrians* them-
 “ selves, as an Example of the great Antiquity
 “ and Worth of that Version of theirs.

ANSW. Doubtless, what our Adversary advan-
 ceth here, he owes to *Grotius*, * who makes this
 Conjecture. “ Perhaps one may suppose, that
 “ for לקח *Lakachet*, which signifies *thou hast*
 “ *received*, was written חלק *Chalketh*, which
 “ usually signifies, *to give*, as *Deuteron. iv. 19.*
 “ *Job xxxix. 17.* and from that comes ἔδωκε, *he*
 “ *gave*, which Word *St. Paul* makes use of, &c.”
 He endeavours to support it by the same Testi-
 monies and Authorities. But was Mr. *Whiston*
 ignorant that there are in *Hebrew* some pregnant
 Words, which carry a twofold Signification? and
 this the said *Grotius* grants as to the Verb לקח
Lakach, subjoining at the End of his Note:
 “ But we must understand that to be *receiv’d* is
 “ also rightly said, of such Things as are *receiv’d*
 “ for this End that they may be *given*, as we
 “ may see *Exod. xxv. 2. 1 King. xvii. 10.*” Our
 Antagonist might have learned this from his own
 Country Men of *England. Henr. Hammond*, in his
 Annotations upon this Place of the *Ephesians*,
 rightly observes. “ That which is here ἔδωκε,
 “ *gave*, is in the *Greek* of *Psal. lxviii. 19.* ἔλαβες *re-*
 “ *ceived*, probably from the Nature of the *He-*
 “ *brew* חלק as it signifies *to give*, so it is to
 “ *receive* also; as in *English* to *take* sometimes
 “ signifies to *give*; and in *Greek* λαμβανω and
 “ δίδωμι are all one.” This he might have
 learned also from * *Edw. Pocock*, who inculcates
 the very same Thing; so that it is wonderful

* Annot. ad *Psal. lxviii. 19.*
 Portam *Mosis*, c. 2. p. 24.

* *Notar. Miscell. ad*

how our sharp-sighted Critick should be so blind in the Mid-day Sun-shine. *St. Paul* used the Verb *ἔδωκε*, both that he might shew for what End *Christ* had *received*, namely, that he might communicate those Gifts which he had received, not for himself but for others; as also that he might make known the Fulness of the Scripture, and inform us what Depth, what Emphasis there was in the Verb *לָקַחְתָּ* *Lakachet*, in this *Psalms*. And this is so far from being Faulty, or deserving Censure, that it rather strikes considerable Light into *David's* Prophecy. See what we have observed at N^o. xv. p. 113.

“ Afterwards *Mr. Whiston* (p. 103.) proceeds
 “ to those Quotations in the New Testament,
 “ which at present are altogether *wanting* in the
 “ Old; from whence it may be evidently manifest,
 “ that the *Hebrew* Copies have suffer'd a
 “ notable Corruption, since the first Century.

ANSW. We have already prevented this Charge a little before, in our Observations at N^o. ix. and N^o. x. p. 108. Yet that our Adversary may have no Pretence of triumphing, let us trace his Instances, and see what this mighty Boaster brings, after his big Pretences.

OBJ. I. Page 104. “ *Salmon*, says *St. Matthew*,
 “ [Ch. i. 5.] begat *Booz* of *Rachab*, this last Circumstance of the Mother's Name, is now nowhere mention'd in the Old Testament.

ANSW. *Grotius* thinks it was derived from the *Jewish* Traditions; but our Antagonist, that it was taken out of the *Hebrew* Copy, from which it was afterwards lost. Both of them are without any Foundation, and both injurious to the divinely inspired Scripture. It is much better to say, that *St. Matthew* knew it by divine Inspiration, and that the Holy Ghost had weighty and pregnant Reasons, why it pleased him to make Men-

tion of *Rachab*, as well as of *Thamar*, *Ruth*, and *Bathsheba*, in the Genealogy of *Christ*, that Gentiles by Birth, and grievous Sinners might take Comfort to themselves, when they should understand that they also had a Share in the Nativity of *Christ*.

OBJ. II. Page 104. " *St. Matthew* [Ch. ii. 23.] assures us, that *Jesus came and dwelt in a City called Nazareth; that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the Prophets, he shall be called a Nazarene.* This which was in the Days of *St. Matthew* perhaps in more Prophets than one, is now in none at all.

ANSW. We have given a full Account of these Words at the N^o. x. p. 108.

OBJ. III. Page 104. " *St. Matthew* assures us, as his original Copy appears to have had the Text, that *Christ* therefore spake in Parables, [Ch. xiii. 35.] *That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Isaiah the Prophet, saying, I will open my Mouth in Parables, I will utter Things which have been kept secret from the Foundation of the World: while yet our present Copies have no such Passage at all in that Prophecy.*

ANSW. Mr. *Whiston*, contrary to all Right and Reason, departs from the Original, and inserts the Name of *Isaiab* into the Text. For in the Greek it is simply read thus: Ὅπως πληρωθῇ τὸ ρηθὲν διὰ τῶν προφῆτων λέγοντων, *That it might be fulfilled, which was spoken by the Prophet saying,* where the Name of *Isaiab* is not mentioned. For by the Prophet, he means the Author of the lxxviii Psalm, the second Verse of which is here quoted. But what Things are afterwards v pleaded for *Isaiab*, are of no such great Moment, that they

should cancel and destroy the unanimous Consent of all the *Greek* Copies.

OBJ. IV. Page 105. " Our Saviour assures us, " that *Zachariah* the Son of *Barachiah* was slain " by the *Jews* between the Temple and the Al- " tar, *Matth.* xxiii. 35. as the last Instance of the " old Prophets which the *Jews* had slain. This " Character agrees so perfectly to *Zechariah* whose " Prophecy is still extant, who was the Son of " *Barachiah*, and one of the last of the old Pro- " phets of the *Jews*, and to no body else, that we " ought to conclude that it was meant of him " and of him only. Yet we have no such Histo- " ry now in the Old Testament.

ANSW. But * we have upon another Occasion made it out to have been a quite different Per- son from *Zechariah* the Author of the Canonical Book, who is here intended by our Saviour; wherefore we don't offer here to repeat what Things were then well considered, and probably advanced. Yet admitting what other very considerable Men of our Commentators have believed, that it was one and the same *Zechariah* whose Prophecy we have, and whose violent Death in the Temple our Saviour mentions, yet it does not necessarily follow, that *Christ* took out of the Books of the Old Testament the historical Passage which he gives us of him. Many other Facts are related in the New Testament, of which there is no Mention made in the Old, and yet there is no Necessity of charging the *Hebrew* Copy with any Defect upon that Score. See our Remarks at No. xi. p. 109.

OBJ. V. Page 105. " Our Saviour says concern- " ing *John* the Baptist, *Mark* ix. 13. That *Elias*

* Introd. ad Lib. V. T. p. 3. cap. 17. S. I. p. 441.

“ is indeed come, and they have done unto him what-
 “ soever they listed, as it is written of him. This
 “ Part of the ancient Prediction, which foretold
 “ the Suffering of *John* the Baptist, is not now
 “ in the Old Testament at all. The proper Place
 “ for it seems to be the End of *Malachi*; which
 “ may therefore be not improbably look’d upon
 “ as at present a little imperfect.

ANSW. *Robert Stephens* hath given a proper So-
 lution to this Difficulty, by including in a *Paren-*
thesis those Words in the Middle; *καὶ ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ*
ὅσα ᾔθελεσαν, And they did to him what they pleased,
 and so making a *εὐχρησις*, a *Transposition of Words*,
 in the Proposition. Many other like Examples
 may be seen in *Glaffius*. As to the Sense then,
 the Words are to be thus order’d; But I say un-
 to you, that *Elias* bath come, as is written of him,
Mal. ii. 5. but they have done unto him, &c. In this
 way the Martyrdom of *John* the Baptist is not
 foretold in the Old Testament, neither will the
 Text of *Malachi* be defective, but all will be ve-
 ry consistent.

OBJ. VI. Page 105. “ Our Saviour quotes this
 “ remarkable Passage out of the Old Testament,
 “ *Luke xi. 49.* Therefore also said the Wisdom of
 “ God, I will send them Prophets and Apostles, and
 “ some of them they shall slay and persecute, &c. See
 “ *Matth. xxiii. 34, 35.* yet cannot we now find
 “ any such Text there.

ANSW. That in these Words any Text of
 the Old Testament is cited, is the main Thing in
 Question, which no Man acquainted with the
 Holy Scriptures will give up to Mr. *Whiston*. It
 is manifest from *Matth. xxiii. 34, &c.* that they
 are the Words of *Christ*; and he in *Prov. viii.*
21, &c. and other Places, is called the Wisdom

of the Father; but that *Christ* took these Words from the *Hebrew* Copy of his Time, does not appear from any thing in *St. Matthew*. Indeed from the Texts of the Evangelists compared together, it is manifest, that those Words were spoken at different Times, and upon different Occasions. For in *St. Matthew* he spoke those Words in the Temple, to the People and to his Disciples, upon the Days which immediately preceded his Passion and Death; *Chap. xxiii. i. xxiv. i.* But in *St. Luke* they were spoken upon occasion of an Entertainment, as *Christ* was sitting at Table amidst the *Pharisees*. Whether therefore *Christ* himself quoted those Words of *the Wisdom of God*, which at other Times had been often pronounced by him against the *Pharisees*, as if he had said: *And therefore, I say unto you*, (according to *Joach. Camerarius*, and the greater part of Interpreters, and which indeed the Context seems to call for, *ψ 51, and 53.*) Or whether *St. Luke* inserted those Words by way of *Parentthesis* from other Sayings of *Christ*, to this Effect; That because *Christ* at Table accuseth the *Pharisees* as guilty of so many Murders committed upon the Saints, *St. Luke* might add, that it is not to be wonder'd at, since in other Places the *Wisdom of God*, *i. e. Christ*, had said, *Lo, I send unto you*, &c. and again, because *St. Luke* had fallen upon the History of this Entertainment at the *Pharisees*, which is no where else related, and upon that Occasion tells us of *Christ's* Discourse spoken in the way of Reproof to the *Pharisees*, like to what he had said in the Temple, *Matth. xxiii.* *St. Luke* not intending to make a tedious Narrative of it, yet was willing to repeat those remarkable Words in a kind of *Parentthesis*; as is shrewdly conjectured by *Dorfeus*: Which ever of these Ways you interpret it,

it, our Cause is safe, and there is no Room left for reproaching the Old Testament.

OBJ. VII. Page 106. " Our Saviour also quotes " another Text expressly out of the Scriptures of " the Old Testament, *John vii. 38. He that believeth in me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his Belly shall flow Rivers of living Water.* But " such Scripture is not now extant among us.

ANSW. There are two Ways of explaining this Matter, and neither of them much amiss. Some refer those Words, *καθὼς εἶπεν ἡ γραφή*, as the Scripture hath said, to the preceding Words, and to the Subject of the Proposition, so that the Sense may be, *He who believeth in me*, in such manner as the Holy Scripture commands us to believe, *out of his Belly*, &c. This is the Opinion of *Cbrysoftom*, followed by *Ludovicus de Dieu*, *Heinsius*, *Walæus*, and of our Communion *Tarnovius*, *Glassius*, *Pruknerus*, *Quistorpius*, *Calovius*, and last of all ²*Lefcherus*. Others again think that it respects the following Promise, *From his Belly shall flow Rivers of living Water*, which is taken from the Oracles of the Old Testament, if not as to the formal Words, yet certainly as to the Sense: Of this Number are *Calvin*, *Herborn*, *Surenhusius*, p. 355. where he refers to *Isa. lviii. 11*. Of our Communion *Seb. Schmidius*, in his Latin Version, whereupon the Margin he refers to *Isa. xlv. 3. Joel ii. 28.* And lastly, ²*Jac. Altingius* thinks that this way of quoting has respect rather to the whole Contexture of his Discourse, and that it chiefly points at *Isa. xli. 17, 18.* Indeed it is very clear,

First, That not so much the Words of the Old Testament are cited by *Christ*, as the Sense of the

² In den Zehenden Evangel. P. 4. p. 320.
P. 4. p. 23.

^a Opp. T. 4.

Scripture is declared in Words differing a little, yet accommodated to the Purpose in Hand, according to what we observed at the N^o. xiii. p. 110, &c.

Secondly, That all those Places which promise a full Effusion of the Gifts of the Holy Ghost to Believers, are jointly referred to by *Christ*; so that to the Texts already cited, may be added *Isa. xii. 3*, and other like Places, according to what we have intimated at N^o. ix. p. 108. And then the Sense of this Form of speaking will amount to this; *as the Scripture every where teaches you, or which is also the Mind of Scripture*. Those Things being rightly applied, we do not deny but that the Quotation may belong to *Christ's* whole continued Discourse, (in the Middle of which it is with very good Reason placed) but without supposing any part of the Old Testament to be lost.

OBJ. VIII. and IX. Page 106. "In *Acts* vii. 23. "St. Stephen says of *Moses*, and when he was full "forty Years old, it came into his Heart to visit his "Brethren the Children of Israel: Again he observes "of him in the 30th Verse, And when forty Years "were expired, there appeared to him in the Wilderness of Mount Sinai an Angel of the Lord in "a Flame of Fire in a Bush: which Number of "his Years is wholly wanting in the History of "Moses, and yet the Jewish Accounts testify, that "in ancient Times it was read there.

ANSW. I wish our Adversary had cited those Testimonies of the *Jews* about these forty Years, that we might pass our Judgment upon them: But what may be replied here, will be easily known from our Observations upon N^o. xi. p. 109.

OBJ. X. Page 106. "St. Paul in *Rom.* iii. 13. "—18. quotes six whole Verses from *Psal.* xiv. "which are now wanting in the *Hebrew*, yet "they

“ they are read in some of the best Copies of
 “ the *Septuagint*.

ANSW. This is one of those Places which the
 Papists, *Cochlæus*, *Lindanus*, and others long be-
 fore him have objected. But among the An-
 cients, ^b *Jerom* hath given a satisfactory Account
 of it, in his Answer to the Virgin *Eustochium*: Of
 later Authors, ^c *Johannes Isaacus* a converted Jew.
 We have already spoken to it at the N^o. ix. p. 108.
 If any Man desires more, he may join to those we
 have named, ^d *Surenhusius*.

OBJ. XI. Page 106. “ The same Apostle [*Eph.*
 “ v. 14.] quotes the Words of God: *Wherefore*
 “ *he saith, awake thou that sleepest, and Christ*
 “ *shall give thee Light.* Of which there is nothing
 “ remaining in the Old Testament.

ANSW. But the Sense appears entire in *Isaiab*
 lx. 12. which St. Paul dexterously applied to his
 own Purpose. See what we have said at N^o. x.
 p. 108. and ^e *Surenhusius*.

OBJ. XII. Page 107. “ Again the Apostle,
 “ *Tim. v. 18.* affirms, *That the Scripture says,*
 “ *that the Labourer is worthy of his Reward;*
 “ which Scripture is now wanting.

ANSW. Yet you have the Sense of it, *Deut. xxiv.*
 14. *Levit. xix. 13.* as we made it appear before at
 the N^o. x. p. 108. And *Christ* also had before ad-
 apted these Words with a slight Alteration to his
 own Purpose, *Matth. x. 10. Luke x. 7.*

OBJ. XIII. Page 107. “ In 2 *Tim. iii. 1.* *Jannes*
 “ and *Jambres* as Magicians of that Time, well
 “ known from the History of the Old Testament,
 “ are named by St. Paul, but their Names are
 “ quite lost out of our *Hebrew* Copies. Yet must
 “ they have been there in the first Century,

^b In prologo sexti decimi Commentarii in *Jesaiam.* ^c In
Defensione veritatis Hebraicæ contra Lindanum, p. 31, &c.
^d Pag. 443, &c. ^e P. 687, &c.

“ since the ^f *Apostolical Constitutions* also have
 “ them; and the *Jews* likewise own them, as
 “ two real Names of those Magicians, to this
 “ Day. See ^g *Fabricius*.

ANSW. Here apply what was observed at the
 No. xi. p. 109. To which add, what ^h *Joachim Zeb-*
nerus hath learnedly remark'd upon the Place;
 the *Targum* of *Jonathan*, as it is commonly called,
 upon *Exod. vii. 11, 12.* the Words *חַרְשֵׁי מִצְרַיִם* *Char-*
tume Mitzrayim, names *Jannes* and *Jambres*; and
 again at *Numb. xxii. 22.* calls the two Servants of
Balaam, *Janus* and *Jamres*, who in ⁱ *Medrasch Rab-*
both are called *Jochani* and *Mamre*. These Things
 consider'd, I shall not deny, but those Names
 were known in the Age of the Apostles by Tra-
 dition: yet I maintain, that *St. Paul* inserted those
 Things into the sacred Writings upon the sole
 Authority of divine Revelation, and the imme-
 diate Influence and Inspiration of the Holy Ghost,
 whence it is, that this Portion of Scripture is al-
 so divinely inspired. But it is no matter whence
 the *Apostolick Constitutions* had these Accounts,
 since they are of a much later Date, and do not
 belong to the Apostles. *Cotelerius* also, upon the
 Place quoted, informs us in how many different
 Ways the Names of those Men have been handed
 down to us.

OBJ. XIV. Page 107. “ The Author of the *He-*
 “ *brews* inform us of some of the old Prophets or
 “ Servants of God [*Heb. xi. 37.*] who were *slain*
 “ *ned*; and of others who were *sawn asunder*; and
 “ of others that were *slain with the Sword*. The
 “ Expression *sawn asunder*, is generally and just-
 “ ly interpreted of *Isaiah* the Prophet, because
 “ the Ancients do all agree, that the *Jews* in the

^f Lib. 8. c. 1. ^g Cod. Pseudepig. Vet. Test. p. 813. -- 825.
^h Centur. 5. Adagio 22. p. 728. ⁱ Fol. 126. col. 3.

“ Days of *Manasseh*, did saw this Prophet to
 “ Death. Of which yet the present Copies of
 “ the sacred Books say nothing. Accordingly
 “ * *Justin Martyr* directly charges the *Jews*, with
 “ erasing this particular Fact out of their Bible.

ANSW. Here we have another Specimen of Mr. *Whiston's* Logick, while he argues in this Manner: The Apostle speaks of some of the Saints being cut asunder; therefore he will have them to have been cut asunder with a Saw, therefore he will have this to be particularly meant of *Isaiab*; therefore this Martyrdom of *Isaiab* was related in the Copy of the Old Testament, and St. *Paul* quoted it from thence; therefore this Fact was fraudulently erased out of the *Hebrew* Copy by the *Jews*. Who would not admire such a subtle Disputant! But what Value or Esteem the *Jews*, the Fathers, the latter Writers have put upon that Tradition, of *Isaiab* being cut asunder with a Saw of Cedar-wood, we have ¹ considered at full length, and we have shewn how ill it hangs together, and for what Reasons that Fiction, by whatever Means it hath been propagated, ought to be exploded and disapproved of. Moreover we absolutely deny, that the Apostle either spoke particularly of *Isaiab*, or that by the Word *ἐπέ-συναν*, they were cut or sawn asunder, he quoted any Text of the Old Testament: We rather judge, since he speaks in the Plural Number, that he thought of more than one who met with the same Fate, and that he had a View to later Examples, and perhaps to those Torments and Punishments which godly Martyrs of the *Jews* suffered in the Time of the *Epiphanian* Persecution, as *Campeg. Vitringa* probably conjectures. Neither have we

* Dial. cum Tryph. p. 349.
 Test. S. 2. p. 96, &c.

¹ Introduct. in h. lib. Vet.

any regard to *Justin's* Authority, who in this Place, and upon many other Occasions, following Tradition, disputes *ad hominem* against *Trypho*, as against a Man that well knew and maintained that Tradition, which was indeed binding upon him, but not upon them who knew better. But from whencesoever it was that the later Fathers took this Fable (after the time that, according to Mr. *Whiston's* Opinion, it had dropp'd out of the *Hebrew* Copy) from the same do we believe *Justin* also to have taken it, and not from the Scripture.

OBJ. XV. Page 108. " The same Author to
 " the *Hebrews* informs us, from the ancient Books
 " of that Age, *Heb. xii. 21.* That *so terrible was*
 " the Sight at Mount Sinai, that *Moses said I ex-*
 " ceedingly fear and quake. But the Old Testa-
 " ment has now no such Passage.

ANSW. There is no doubt but *Moses* greatly fear'd and trembled at that majestick Appearance, too dazling for frail Mortality, since all these Things were done for proving *Israel*, and that the Fear of God might be before their Eyes, that they might not sin, *Exod. xx. 19, 20.* For the Consciousness of Sin and Infirmary, could not without trembling sustain the Approach of a Law-giver, revealing himself with such awful Solemnity. It is also evident, that when the Voice of the Trumpet sounded long, and waxed louder and louder, *Moses spake, and God answer'd him by a Voice, Exod. xix. 19.* we have no Account however of the Words which were spoken, but it was by immediate and special Revelation, that they were made known to *St. Paul*, and so he publish'd them to the World. In like Manner *Hosea* knew, by particular divine Revelation, that *Jacob*, when he wrestled with the Son of God, wept and made Supplication, *ch. xii. 4.* which Circumstance

cumstance *Moses* had past over in silence. Compare what we have observed above at No. xi. p. 109. We therefore wonder at *P Drusius* for imagining that the Apostles wrote those Things from the Records of their Rulers; whereupon, towards the End of his Discourse he concludes from this Place, that the profane History of the *Jews* is not altogether to be rejected, because the Apostle made use of it. The holy Scriptures certainly ought to have been treated with more Religion and Reverence.

OBJ. XVI. Page 108. " St. *James* directly alleges this Citation from the Old Testament, *James* iv. 5. *Do ye think that the Scripture saith in vain, The Spirit that dwelleth in us lusteth to Envy?* But our present Scripture affords us no such Passage.

ANSW. *P Drusius* again is not afraid to do Injury to the Scripture, when he says, " This seems to be one of those Testimonies, which are not now extant; because the Books in which they were then read, have since perished." As to which unjustifiable Censure, I could wish that it had never dropp'd from a Person otherwise very learned, and one that has deserved so well of the *Hebrew* Text. *r Simon Episcopus*, in the former Part of his Discourse, inclining to the same Opinion, presently after corrects himself, proceeding thus: " If, moreover any Man ask; what is therefore that Place of Scripture, to which St. *James* makes a Reference? I shall answer, that I do not know. I believe it may possibly be so, that the Text of Scripture, in which that particular Part was then extant, hath been lost: Or, if that cannot be allow'd of, perhaps St.

P Notis in parallela Sacra h. l. *q* In parallel. ad h. l.
r In Respons. & Quæst. 4. T. I. opp. p. 2. p. 4.

“ *James* meant by those Words, *the Scripture*
 “ *saiib*, not the same Words as expressly set down,
 “ but that the Sense of them was comprised
 “ and wrapp’d up in those few Words, in which
 “ he comprehended, and by which he referr’d
 “ to several different Texts at once.” This
 last Opinion of his is very true, and I very
 much approve of it. For the Words, as St. *James*
 writes them, are not to be found in the Scrip-
 ture, Old or New. But we are obliged by all
 those solid Arguments, by which our Divines
 fully demonstrate the Perfection of the Scripture,
 against the *Papists* and false Criticizers, never to
 believe that any Canonical Books have been lost,
 or however, that any Prophecies which were in
 them have perished: Wherefore, what we have
 hinted above at N^o. x. p. 108. takes place
 also here, that oftentimes the Sense, nay some-
 times a Consequence is quoted in Words, which
 in their own Place are express’d very differ-
 rently. What that Place is, as to the Words
 we are now speaking of, Commentators vary.
 Many famous Doctors, and with them *Henry*
Hammond, fetch these Words from *Gen. vi. 3.*
 whom * *Cartwright* hath solidly confuted. Others
 think that St. *James* took this Sentence from
Exod. iii. 32. *Cajetan* and *Cornel. a Lapide*, derive
 it from *Exod. xx. 5.* Others from *Deut. vii. 2, 5.*
Thomas Aquinas from *Job v. 2.* *Sam. Ward* from
Prov. xxi. 1. Others from *Rom. xii. 2.* *Lucus Ofi-*
ander from *Gal. v. 17.* *Hugo* and *Lyranus* from
 ch. i. 4. of the Book of *Wisdom*: Finally, the
 greater Part of modern Interpreters, *Junius*,
Piscator, *Lud. Cappellus*, * *Gataker*, * *Surenbusius*.
 And of our Communion * *Glassius* more especial-

* In Electis Targumico-Rabbinicis ad h. l. Genes.
 yersarior Miscell. Posthumor. c. 19.
 Sacr. Lib. 4. Tr. 2. cap. 7. p. 591.

† P. 674.

* Ad-
 * Phil.

ly derives it from *Numb. xi. 29.* where *Moses* speaks to *Joshua* in these Terms: *Enviest thou for my sake?* So that this particular Instance may be transferr'd to a general Case; which Interpretation latest of any *Herm. Witsius*, without mentioning the Name of *Glassius*, hath improved and defended. But no Man after due Examination, can deny that all those Solutions are but forc'd, and far fetch'd. We always judg'd upon that as the safest Opinion, which *Salmeron*, *Justinianus*, *Estius*, *Calvin*, *Paræus* of the *Dutch*, and finally of us *Germans*, *D. Brochmandus*, do embrace, that *St. James* had no particular View to any single Place of Scripture, only he intended to say and teach, that envy is to be shunn'd, by an Argument taken from this Topick, That the Scripture every where teacheth us, that the Heart of Man, by a certain inborn Depravity of Nature, is very prone to Envy. That remarkable leading Observation in *Gen. vi. 5. viii. 21.* afforded a general Ground to this Quotation: And as to a special Foundation, all those other Places shew it. which sets forth either the Examples of Envy, or the Dissuasives against it, or the Vileness of it, to which relate most of those Texts, which a little before we took Notice of, as pitch'd upon by learned Men to found the Quotation in this Place upon. In this way we are neither obliged to turn a plain simple Sentence into an Interrogation, implying a Negative; nor to interpret *φθόνος* *envy*, to a good Sense, against the natural and genuine Signification of the Word; nor to dismember the Apostles Words by a different Punctuation; which Inconveniences, and several more attend the other Opinions².

¹ Meletemat. Leidens. Disput. xii. S. 19, &c. p. 446.

² As to this Text of *St. James*, [*Ch. iv. 5.*] the two last

OBJ. XVII. Page 108. " St. Peter gives us a remarkable History concerning the Fall of the Angels, in these Words; 2 Peter ii. 4. God spared not the Angels that sinned, but cast them down to Hell, and delivered them into Chains of Darkneſs, to be reſerved unto the Judgment. And St. Jude ꝑ 6, agrees in the ſame Account; as if it were then a known History in the Old Teſtament. Yet is there nothing like it there in our modern Copies.

ANSW. Neither ſhould it be read there by any Force of the Apoſtles Words, in which no Footſteps of a Citation appears, from whence you can conclude that they are taken out of the Old Teſtament. But the Thing itſelf, as to the Fall of the wicked Angels, from the History of the Fall of our firſt Parents, Gen. iii. from the wicked Spirit poſſeſſing Saul, 1 Sam. xvi. 14. from the History of Job, i. and ii. and from other Places of the Old Teſtament, was abundantly known and made publick in the Age of the Apoſtle, both among the Jews (whoſe Cabbaliſts give many Accounts about it, from ancient Tradition) as alſo among the Chriſtians, who had much fuller Information from the Aſſertion of Chriſt our Saviour, John viii. 44. and other Places in the New Teſtament; ſo that St. Jude by this Form of Speech, *Ἰπομνηſαι ὑμᾶς βελομαι*, I will therefore put you in remembrance, might very opportunely put his Hebrew Brethren in remembrance of a Matter ſo well known among all.

OBJ. XVIII. Page 109. " St. Jude has preſerved to us a moſt ancient and moſt remarkable Prophecy, inſcrib'd to Enoch, in theſe

Writers who have moſt minutely and accurately conſidered it, are Elſner (in his Obſervationes Sacrae, Vol. 2. p. 393.) and the very learned unknown Author of Fortuita Sacra, publiſhed at Rotterdam, A. D. 1727. MOSES MARCUS.

" Words,

“ Words, *St. Jude* v 14, 15. *Enoch* also, the seventh from *Adam*, prophesied of these, saying, *Behold the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his Saints; (or with his holy Myriads) to execute Judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them, of all their ungodly Deeds, which they have ungodly committed; and of all the hard Speeches which ungodly Sinners have spoken against him.* Which Prophecy has been intirely lost out of the Old Testament.

ANSW. I may truly say, that Cart Loads of Interpretations have been made upon this Passage, yet they do not agree upon the Original Prophecy from which *St. Jude* had it. Some plead that it was taken out of some written Book, either *Canonical*, as our Adversary would have it to impeach the *Hebrew* Copy of an Omission, or *Apocryphal*, as ^a *Scaliger* alledges; whom a great many others have followed. But as to that Book which passeth by the Name of *Enoch*, since even by the Testimony of *Scaliger*, it is so trifling and mean, and every way *Apocryphal*, neither is there any thing in it in the least agreeable to this Sentence of *St. Jude*, we may justly doubt of the Apostles having taken any such History from it. *Coccejus* is of Opinion, that all this Prophecy is collected from the History of *Moses*, observing that *St. Jude* introduces *Enoch* prophesying such Things as might be handsomely and pathetically ascribed to him by the Figure *Prosopopæia*. But *St. Jude* recites those Words, not as if they could be assigned to *Enoch* by a *Prosopopæia*, but as being really foretold by him to his own Contemporaries, he having learned them by divine Revelation, *προεφήτασε γὰρ, κ. τ. λ.* for he prophesied, &c. hence some observing that *St. Jude* appeals to

^a In suis Eufebianis, p. 404, &c.

no writing of *Enoch* or *Moses*, only he asserts, that he prophesied Orally or Vocally, deny that *St. Jude* took it from any written Book. Lastly, some of them have recourse to a Tradition well known at that Time, the Truth of which, the Apostle knew by Revelation of the Spirit, and therefore judged it worthy to have its Memory perpetuated in this his Epistle: This is the Opinion of ^b *Herm. Witsius*. But we who doubt the Credit of all Traditions, especially the *Jewish*, and such as pretend to so great Antiquity, chuse rather to refer the whole Thing to immediate divine Inspiration and Revelation, by which as all his Epistle and the whole Scripture, so likewise this Sentence was dictated to *St. Jude*.

OBJ. XIX. Page 110. “^c *St. Clement* in his “undoubted Epistle to the *Corinthians*, and in “Part, *Clement* ^d of *Alexandria* after him cite “this Passage out of *Ezekiel*: Say unto the Children of my People, if your Sins be from Earth “to Heaven; and if they be redder than Scarlet, “and blacker than Sackcloth; and ye be converted “unto me with your whole Heart, and say, Father; “I will hear you as an holy People. Which Text “is not now in that Prophecy, nor any where “else in our present Old Testament.

ANSW. First, Again, there is no Consequence in this Conclusion; the Fathers cited some prophetical Sentences, otherwise than they are at this time read in the Copy of the Bible, therefore the authentick Copy is corrupted. The Fathers may have erred, either as citing from their Memory, and so they recite not the Particulars accurately, or in due Order; or as industriously turning and accommodating scriptural Sentences to their

^b Com. in h. l. S. 41. Meletem Leidens. p. 503. ^c 1 Clem. S. 8. ^d Pædagog. c. 10.

own Purpose, which hath been a common Custom among Preachers in all Ages: yet their Authority and Credit shall never be preferable to the inspired Word, over which the Divine Providence always has been particularly watchful to keep it from receiving any Detriment. *Patricius Junius* hath shrewdly and justly remark'd upon this Place of *Clemens Rom.* "The Words of
 " the Context are otherwise; but we ought to
 " observe of this Place, and other Testimonies
 " of Scripture, which are frequently cited in this
 " Epistle, that sometimes many Places are join'd
 " in one (which is often done by other Fathers,
 " and sometimes the Apostles themselves furnish
 " us with Examples of this Kind) and frequently
 " the Sense is express'd, but not the Words,
 " both which we find in this Place. Yea very
 " often we meet with considerable Difference in
 " the Words themselves.

Secondly, In these Words then it is evident, that the Sense, but not the Words of the prophetical Exhortations are quoted, in order to move them to Repentance, as also that many Words are joined together, from which this Sentence is made up, which *Clement* probably gather'd from *Psalms* ciii. 11, &c. *Isa.* i. 18. *Jerem.* iii. 12, 13. xxix. 11, &c. and perhaps out of other Places also.

Thirdly, and lastly, Mr. *Whiston* deals unfairly; for first, he is guilty of the Fallacy of *Composition* and *Division*, as the Logicians term it, and he designedly omits the Words immediately preceding in *Clemens*, and manifestly taken out of *Ezek.* xxxiii. 11. And then again he attributes these other Words to *Ezekiel*, as if they had been a Continuation of the Words of *Ezekiel*, and yet *Clement* no where affirms that they were taken from *Ezekiel*. For if our Adversary had intended to dispute fairly, he ought to have attributed to *Eze-*

kiel what undoubtedly belonged to him, and at the same Time to have acknowledg'd and confess'd, that the following Sentence was compiled from diverse Sayings of the Prophets, and should not have ascribed them to *Ezekiel*. But that he might have some Pretence for charging Scripture with an Omission, he first suppresses the true Words of *Ezekiel*, and on the other hand, he narrowly searches his Prophecy to find out Things foreign and no wise belonging to him, and which are not taken out of his Book by *Clement*, and then falsely gives it out, that these Things are lost. If this be not, I know not what it is to play the Sycophant.

Obj. XX. Page 110. " The same * *St. Clement* in the same Epistle to the *Corinthians*, informs us, as an Instance of the Humility of *Moses*, that he said, *I am but a Vapour out of a Pot*; which Words we now no where find in the Old Testament.

Ans. Although † *Jo. Chiffletius* thinks these Words of *Clement* concerning *Moses*, to have sprung from the Corruption of the Greek Words, which are read, *Exod. vi. 30.* and ‡ *Merie Casaubon* varnishes over that Conjecture in a Manner somewhat different, judging, ἀπερ ἀτμὶς ἐκ τοῦ χύτρου, which is as a Vapour out of a Pot, to have proceeded from ἀπερὶ τμητὸς τοῖς χείλεσιν, uncircumcised in Lips: Yet I rather incline to think that these unscriptural Words came from some Apocryphal Book, many of which were handed about in the primitive Times, both among the Jews and Christians. If any Man desires more upon this Head, he may read upon the Place the Annotations of *Cotelerius*, *Patricius Junius* and *Fell*,

* Clem. S. 17.
Sanctam num. 60.

† In Apologetica parænesi ad Linguam
‡ De Lingua Hebraica, p. 115.
who

who have commented learnedly upon it ; for the rest, the Reader may look back to what was said in answer to the preceding Objection in the first Article.

OBJ. XXI. Page 111. " The same ^h St. Clement
 " cites another remarkable Passage as a Scripture
 " Prophecy, and the Citation is in both his Epistles, *Let that Scripture, or prophetick Oracle, be far from us, which says, miserable are the double-minded, who are of a doubtful Soul; who say, we have heard these Things also from our Fathers, and behold we have grown aged, and none of these Things have befallen us, &c.*" which prophetick Oracle is not now elsewhere extant.

ANSW. You have the Sense of that Sentence, *Ecclus ii. 12, &c. Jer. v. 12;* although *Cotelerius* rather inclines to make it an *apocryphal* Writing. However that be, *Clement's* Authority and Credit, are not considerable enough to bear Testimony against the Holy Scripture.

OBJ. XXII. Page 111. " The same ⁱ St. Clement, in his undoubted Epistle, quotes this Passage out of the Scripture, *It is written, cleave to the Saints; for they that cleave to them shall be sanctified.* But the present Copies of the Old Scriptures give us no such Text there.

ANSW. This Passage is of the same Nature with the former ; for we meet with like Sentences in Scripture, *Phil. iii. 17.* and in other Places. Although there is no Necessity, that these Things should have been written in the Holy Scriptures: for they might have been extant in some other ecclesiastical Book.

Finally, our Author points out to his Reader other Places like to these, both of the New Testament, and likewise of the primitive Fathers,

but he did not think them of such Moment, as to give an Account of them one by one, but only mention'd them in general. Wherefore neither shall we spend any Time upon them, chiefly because an Answer may be readily given to every Article, from what we have hinted a little higher up, about the Texts quoted out of the Old Testament in the New.

Now it remains, that we enquire also into the Reasons, by which he endeavours to demonstrate his XIII *Prop.* and to prove, that the Citations of the New Testament were made with great Fidelity and Accuracy, by *Christ* and his Apostles, and that they agreed exactly with the authentick Copies of the Old Testament. And here I observe in the Entrance, that Mr. *Whiston* deals unfairly and insidiously both in his ^k *Proposition*, and in p. 287. to join these two Things together as equivalent, viz. their being quoted with great Fidelity, and their agreeing exactly with the authentick Copies. For these two Things are widely different from each other. We both admit and maintain, that whatever Things are cited out of the Old Testament in the New, are quoted with great Fidelity and Accuracy, since the Spirit of God could not but deal faithfully, in the Inspiration even of those Words, as he was leading the holy Pen-men into all Truth, *John* xvi. 13. testifying, that in these Texts also, *the Spirit is Truth*, 1 *John* v. 6. But ^l we have already shewn, and proved by many Examples, that the *Greek* Reading of the New Testament, very often varies in Expression from the *Hebrew* Reading of the Old, according to the different Scope and Purpose, for which the Texts are alledged, neither indeed could it be otherwise. Wherefore it is entirely

^k P. 287.

^l S. 5. Observations 3.

wrong and fallacious from hence to infer, that either a Citation is not made with sufficient Fidelity, or that those Places are faulty and corrupt, which are expressed one way in the New Testament, and another in the Old: And this being duly observed, the whole Superstructure, which Mr. *Whiston* builds upon that sandy Foundation, falls to the Ground. Moreover it is altogether false, that all Passages of the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Texts of the Old Testament, must have been precisely such, as their Structure in the New Testament requires. That certainly is what the Author supposes out of his own Invention, and which for want of ancient Copies to oppose to the New, he cannot confirm by any proper Argument. But let us briefly consider what he has to say. He argues thus:

OBJ. I. *Page 287.* " Those New Testament
 " Citations taken out of the Old Testament, do
 " still, as to the generality of them, agree with
 " the *Septuagint* Version, whence they were im-
 " mediately cited, even as it stands in our an-
 " cient Copies; and by Consequence, with that
 " *Hebrew* Original which did then agree to it.
 " The Citations or Allusions from the Old Te-
 " stament to the New are about 500, the great-
 " est Part of which agree with the *Septuagint* and
 " *Hebrew* Text. It is not reasonable to suppose
 " that those upright and godly Men should do
 " otherwise than quote truly and fairly, since one
 " false Quotation might do more Hurt to the
 " Christian Cause, than many true ones could do
 " it good, &c.

ANSW. Our Author still diverts and deceives himself with the same Fallacy, as if a Citation were not faithful and exact, unless it consisted precisely of the same Words to a Tittle. Certain it is, that the holy Pen-men were strictly just and

faithful to God and the Church; for if they had been otherwise, they would have been found *ψευδομαρτυρες τῷ Θεῷ, false Witnesses of God; μαρτυροῦντες κατὰ Θεῷ, witnessing against God*: which Imputation the Apostle by all Means removes from himself and the rest of the Apostles, 1 Cor. xv. 15. But then they might be faithful Witnesses, *καὶ πάντες ἀποδοχῆς ἄξιοι, and worthy of all Acceptation*, if they faithfully collected and represented the Mind and Will of God, although they expressed it in somewhat different Words. To prove their Fidelity, it was requisite that they should declare and write nothing but as they were taught, *φειρόμενοι ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου, moved by the Holy Ghost*, 2 Pet. i. 21. But where it pleased the Holy Ghost, by a slight Turning of the Words, to accommodate the Oracles of the Old Testament to his present Purpose and Design, they approved themselves then chiefly faithful, in speaking and writing, not according to the Letter of the Old Testament, but according to the Inspiration and Conduct of the Holy Spirit. From this may be understood, whence it comes to pass, that not only in a few Places, as Mr. *Whiston* thinks, but in very many, those Quotations differ from the original Hebrew, as to the express Words; nevertheless they every where agree to their Context, and every where to the Intention of the Holy Ghost.

OBJ. II. Page 288. “ Those Citations could
 “ not have convinced the unbelieving *Jews* and
 “ Profelytes of the Truth of Christianity, unless
 “ the Texts had been truly quoted, as they were
 “ in the Bibles of that Age: Thus we find *Apol-*
 “ *los mightily convincing the Jews of Achaia, and*
 “ *that publicly, shewing by the Scriptures that Je-*
 “ *sus was Christ, Acts xviii. 28. and St. Paul per-*
 “ *suading them concerning Jesus, &c. Acts xxviii.*
 “ 23. And this to the immediate Conviction of

“ part of his Auditors, who yet came in general
 “ with great Prejudices against him. Nor could
 “ St. *Peter* have esteem’d the Evidence of the
 “ ancient Predictions for Christianity, *βεβαιότερον*
 “ ἢ προφήτικον λόγον, a *Word of Prophecy*, rather
 “ more sure than a Voice from Heaven, as he seems
 “ to do, had the sacred Books then extant no
 “ better agreed to many of these Predictions, as
 “ cited by the first Preachers of the Gospel, than
 “ those do which the *Jews* have since given
 “ us, &c.

ANSW. The convincing of the Adversaries of
 the Truth of the Christian Religion, does not de-
 pend upon the Agreement of the Testimony ci-
 ted with every Word or Tittle of the Original,
 but upon its Agreement with the Religion to be
 proved, and especially upon the intrinsick divine
 Energy of the Holy Scriptures; as is evident
 from *Acts* ii. 37. and other Examples of the Dis-
 courses of the Apostles. So then the Texts cited
 were conformable to the Old Testament, in such
 wise as at present they correspond to it; some of
 them in every Word, others in the Sense; some
 again only according to the Scope of the Cita-
 tion, and others in the most material Part. But
 if we were obliged nicely to insist upon Word for
 Word, then according to Mr. *Whiston's* Opinion,
 it should follow, that as they are now read in the
 present Copy of the Old Testament, they no lon-
 ger carry any convictive Force with them, and
 that the Quotations out of it in the New Testa-
 ment, cannot convince us of the Truth of the
 Christian Religion; which is both injurious to the
 Holy Scriptures, and contrary to Experience.
 St. *Peter* then calls the Word of *Prophecy* surer
 than a heavenly Voice, not because its Citations
 in the New Testament do Word for Word an-
 swer to their Original in the Old Testament, but

because being in manner animated and quickned by the Spirit of God, it pierces even to the Thoughts and Intents of the Heart, as being *sharper than any two-edged Sword*, Heb. iv. 12. To this Virtue infused into the prophetick Writings, it is owing, that by means of them *βεβαιῶσθαι τὴν καρδίαν*, *the Heart is established*, Heb. xiii. 9. Although I know, that a greater Certainty is by others ascribed to the Writings of the Prophets, than to the Word which we hear with our Ears, because they rest upon a twofold way of God's communicating himself to us, the Declaration or Prophecy which was made of them in ancient Times, and the consigning of them to Writing; and this is the Opinion of ^m *Rappoltus*, and ⁿ *Benedict. Carpzovius*. But from hence our Adversary can make no Advantage, for the Support of his *Hypothesis*. Lastly, I deny what he supposeth, that the Holy Scriptures were delivered to the Christian Church by the *Jews*, so late as the second Century; for the Church was in Possession of them long before, even from its first founding.

OBJ. III. *Page 289.* " That Copy of the *Septuagint* Translation, which *Philo* read, confirms
 " the Exactness and full Agreement of the Apo-
 " stolical Quotations, with the Text of the Old
 " Testament. This he pretends to prove by
 " some Testimonies alledged out of *Philo* upon
 " *Gen. ii. 24, &c.*

ANSW. *Philo* is an unfit and altogether improper Witness of the genuine *Hebrew* Reading, being himself ignorant of the *Hebrew* Language, and having only made use of the *Greek* Translation: As to which, that it was not at that time without

^m In Theol. Aphoristica Johannis, cap. 1. Aphor. 4. S. 2, 3. p. 27, &c. ⁿ Disput. Academ. 18. cap. 1. S. 7. pag. 774, &c.

various Lectiōns, and that it did not in every Place render the *Hebrew* Text literally, and that in the succeeding Ages its Readings were various and manifold, till *Origen* reform'd it from the *Alexandrian* Copies, we have shewn elsewhere *, when designedly treating upon this Version. Therefore whatever Agreement or Disagreement *Philo* has with the *Hebrew* Text and the present *Greek*, is nothing to the Purpose.

OBJ. IV. *Page 291.* “ *Josephus*, the most accurate *Jewish* Historian, contemporary with the Apostles, confirms the New Testament, with its Citations and Contents, so far as his Works are concern'd also. ° Thus he interprets a Prophecy in *Daniel* of the Destruction of *Jerusalem* by *Titus Vespasian*, as our Saviour himself does: Thus he hints at the like Interpretation of the *Stone cut out of the Mountain without Hands* in *Daniel* also; which seems directly alluded to by our Saviour, as belonging to himself. Thus he calls *Daniel* a Prophet, as does our Saviour; contrary to the Notions of the modern *Jews*. P Thus he allows that the divine Prophets foretold the Resurrection of Christ from the Dead; with Abundance of other wonderful Things concerning him; as the Writers of the New Testament still quote and interpret them, &c.

ANSW. Well; what does all this prove? it neither shews that *Josephus's* Citations exactly answer Word for Word, to the *Hebrew* or *Greek* of the Old Testament, from which he vastly differs through his whole Book of *Antiquities*; neither does it prove that the Old and New Testament tallied more exactly in his Time, than they do at

* Crit. Sacr. part. 2. c. 2. ° *Joseph. L. x. c. 14. p. 354.*
355. *Matt. xxiv. 15, &c.* P *Antiq. Lib. XVIII. 4. p. 622.*

this Day. ¶ He is much in the right to esteem *Daniel* so highly, and to place him in the same Rank, and upon an equal Foot with the other Prophets: But yet all this put together makes not a Tittle to the Point in Hand. One Thing however is plain, and very easy to prove, that no sufficient Testimony can be fetch'd from *Josephus* for the *Hebrew* reading, whether ancient or modern, since the *Hebrew* reading was what he either did not know, or did not regard.

OBJ. V. Page 292. “ If those Citations had
 “ not been exact and altogether conformable to
 “ the Original *Hebrew*, the Adversaries of the
 “ *Christian* Religion, who opposed it before the
 “ Middle of the second Century, could not have
 “ failed to impeach them and charge them as
 “ false. And yet *Trypho* the *Jew*, against *Justin*
 “ *Martyr*, and *Celsus* the *Epicurean* in his Book
 “ against the *Christians*, never moved any doubt
 “ about the Fairness of those Citations, only they
 “ disputed the Sense of the Prophecies, and their
 “ Application of them to *Christ*.

ANSW. Neither do we read that even *Julian* in the fourth Century, writing against *Cyril*, any way objected to the Citations of the New Testament; neither do we find that the modern *Jews* call them in Question; the only Dispute is about the Sense of the Prophecies of the Old Testament, which is produced and pleaded from them, for Confirmation of the *Christian* Doctrines concerning *Jesus of Nazareth*. For neither they, nor *Trypho*, nor *Celsus*, had any Reason to impugn the Words of the Citations, which although they do not answer as to every Syllable, yet as to the Sense they agree with their Original. For it is from the Interpretation and Sense, and not from

the exact Harmony of all the Words with the *Hebrew* Text, that we drew our Arguments for the *Christian* Religion: which if its Enemies design to impugn and destroy, it is incumbent upon them, not so much to attack the Quotation, as its Explication and conclusive Force.

OBJ. VI. *Page 294.* "The Apostolical Fathers, and most Primitive Writers, do usually bear Witness to those Citations, and attest to their being rightly taken out of the Old Testament."

ANSW. But they no where affirm, that all the Texts in the New Testament quoted from the Old, are cited in the same Words; neither do they give Countenance to it by their own Example: For they quote Passages of Scripture in such a Manner, that they very often vary from the Words, and from the original Order they were set down in. *Justin Martyr*, in his Dialogue with *Trypho*, who is the only Voucher produced by Mr. *Whiston*, and of whom he frequently boasts, does not express the Sentences of the Old Testament quoted in the New, as they are read in the New Testament, tho' this our Adversary has the Boldness to assert; neither does he write the Texts of the New Testament in the same Words as they are read in the New Testament itself. Compare the Words of *Justin* with *Matth.* xxi. 13. xxiii. 27. xiii. 16. *Luke* xi. 41, 52. and those of *Polycarp*, with the Texts he cites, *1 Peter* i. 13, 21. *Luke* vi. 36, 37. *Matth.* v. 3, 10. (not to speak of more Examples, and of like Kind with these) and it will be plain even to the Eye-sight, that the Fathers of that Age, when they quoted Passages, either out of the

* In Dial. p. 53, &c. Londoniensis in 8^o An. 1719. * Epist. ad Philippenses, cap. 2.

Old or the New Testament, or when they cited Testimonies from the New Testament, which were taken into it out of the Old, never made it their Business to hold precisely to the same Words, but they modelled the Phrase of the Words quoted, as the Design of the Subject requir'd, and accommodated it to the Scope which they then had in View.

OBJ. VII. Page 300. " Where we have full
 " Evidence for the ancient Readings in the *Hebrew*
 " Copy, we find the same always retain'd
 " in the Citations which are made in the New
 " Testament. Which that it may appear plain,
 " we must observe, that the Difference between
 " the *Hebrew* Original, or the *Greek* Version of
 " the Old Testament, and the Quotations of the
 " New Testament, are but few in the *Pentateuch*,
 " and still fewer in the *Psalms*. For there
 " are 172 Texts cited out of the *Pentateuch*, 68
 " out of the *Psalms*. Of those 240 Places, you
 " may reckon 220, which very well agree with
 " the Old Testament; and there is no great Difference in the rest.

ANSW. At length, Mr. *Whiston* is oblig'd to submit, and to confess that most of the Citations agree with the modern *Hebrew* Text, and where they disagree, that the Difference is very inconsiderable. Let him therefore no longer go on complaining, that it is manifest upon the Evidence of these Citations, that the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Copies of the Old Testament were corrupted after the new Testament was written: For the Harmony and Agreement of the modern Reading with the Texts cited in the New Testament, rather demonstrates their Integrity. And as to what he infers, that all the Texts cited did in ancient Times exactly answer to the *Hebrew* reading, he begs the Question, and takes for granted

granted the Point in Controverſy. And we have fully examin'd thoſe Places, upon the Credit of which, Mr. *Whiſton* endeavours after a tedious Manner to make good his Affertion; ſo that we don't think that there is any need to do it now over again.

OBJ. VIII. *Page 320.* " The Apoſtolic Citations, which vary from the modern reading of the New Teſtament, do better answer to the Context and Coherence of the ſeveral Places, whence they are taken, than thoſe Words which are read in the preſent Copies of the Old Teſtament. This he pretends to prove by ſome Examples, viz. from *Matth.* i. 23. compar'd with *Iſa.* vii. 14. — from *Matth.* ii. 6. compar'd with *Micah* v. 2. — from *John* xix. 37. compar'd with *Zech.* xii. 10. — from *Rom.* x. 18. with *Pſal.* xix. 5. — from *1 Cor.* xv. 54. with *Iſa.* xxv. 8. — from *Heb.* viii. 8—12. with *Jer.* xxxi. 31—34 — from *Heb.* x. 5—10. with *Pſal.* xl. 6—9. — from *Acts* xv. 16, 17. with *Amos* ix. 11, 12.

ANSW. We have here or there conſider'd theſe Texts before, ſo that we have no need to imploy much Time in Vindication of them: Yet that we may leave no handle for Complaint, we ſhall briefly examine what the Caviller has to object to them one by one.

1. " He objects that (*Iſa.* vii. 14.) וקראת *Vakarath*, and thou ſhalt call his Name Immanuel, is read in the ſecond Perſon of the ſingular Number, but that the Reading of St. *Matth.* i. 23. is preferable, which runs in the third Perſon of the Plural, καλέσουσι τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἐμμανὴλ, and they ſhall call his Name Immanuel; becauſe this Diſcourſe, directed to the *House of David*, runs intirely in the third Perſon plural. Hence is inferr'd, that וקראת *Ka-*
" rath

“ *ratb, thou shalt call*, is a Corruption, since
 “ the first and second Centuries of Christia-
 nity.

Ans. Interpreters are not fully agreed about
 that Verb, nor the Person calling. The LXX,
Symmachus, Aquila, Theodotion, and Rabbi David
Kimchi the Jew, take it in the second Person,
and thou shalt call: But the *Chaldee* renders it in
 the third Person וקרי *Vatbekra*, and *she shall call*,
 and so frequently the *Jewish* Interpreters, who
 think that קראת *Karath* stands for קראת *Karab*,
 according to a common *Syriasm*, of which there
 are many Examples: viz. נפלאת *Neflath*, *Psal.*
cxviii. 23. קראת *Karath*, from קרה *Karab*, with
 an Epenthesis of א *Deut. xxxi. 29.* גנאף *Gnafath*,
Levit. xxv. 21. הלאה *Halath*, *Ezek. xxiv. 11.* In
 this Account, as being the best, we also acquiesce.
 Therefore the Prophet says of the Mother, it
 shall come to pass, that she shall not only con-
 ceive and bring forth, but shall also give a
 Name to the Child; not as *Kimchi* says, because
 it was customary for the Mothers to name their
 Sons; for this is refuted from the Example of
Benjamin, *Gen. xxxv. 18.* and of *St. John*, *Luke*
i. 62. But because *Christ* being ἀπάτωρ, *without*
a Father on Earth, had no Father to impose a
 Name on him. But nevertheless, when *St Mat-*
thew speaks indefinitely καλέσουσι, *they shall call*;
 and the *Syriack* in *Isaiab* impersonally ܝܢܝܬܝܠܝܗ
Vanetkoro, and *he shall be called*; as *Jerom* does,
 all comes to the same. For by the Name, which
 describes and points out his Qualities and Opera-
 tions, (and therefore a *real* Name) his Mother
 should acknowledge and celebrate him, by the
 same should all the People, the whole Church,
 and especially all Believers do it. We see then
 that there is no occasion to offer any Violence to
 the Text: Especially, considering that the Dis-
 course

course directed to the House of *David*, should not run in the *third*, as he would have it, but in the *second* Person plural, and it should have been said וְקָרָאתֶם *Vakarathem*, or as *Tertullian* hath it, and ye shall call: For which Supposition no convincing Reason can be given.

2. "When *St. Matth. ii. 6.* alledges that Oracle, *Micah v. 2.* thus: ὡς σὺ Βηθλεὲμ γῆ Ἰούδα,
ἐδάμωσ' ἐλαχίστη εἰ ἐν πῶς ἡγεμόσιν Ἰούδα, κ. τ. λ.
And thou Bethlehem in the Land of Juda, art not the least among the Princes of Juda; this is much more agreeable to the Scope and Context of the Prophet, than if you read with Micah: But thou Bethlehem Ephrata, וְעַתָּה בְּאֶפְרַת יְהוּדָה *although thou be little among the Thousands of Judah, &c.* From this it is evident, that the genuine Reading is in *S. Matthew.*

ANSW. But by what Argument does he prove this? For the contrary is rather evident from the Prophecy of *Micah*. For through his whole fourth Chapter he had prophesied of the Kingdom of *Christ*, having therein foretold its Erection in *Judea*, and also the Conversion of the Remnant of *Israel*, and of the Gentiles also, with this Comfort encouraging the Minds of the Godly, dejected for Fear of the approaching Captivity and Desolation; as appears from Chap. iv. 10. and Chap. v. 1, 3, &c. Now that they might by some new Token be assured of the Coming of their spiritual Ruler *Christ*, and might the more clearly apprehend it, he expressly points out by Name the very Place of his Nativity, hitherto not known to the Faithful, nor discern'd by the Prophets, *Bethlehem*, the City of *David*, which *Micah* rightly calls וְעַתָּה

Tzanger, little, having a Respect to אלפי יהודה *Alphe Jebudda*, the *Thousands of Judah*, to which it is manifestly opposed in this Place; yet *St. Matthew* denies the same to be ἐλαχίστω ἐν τοῖς ἡγεμόσιν Ἰούδα, the *least among the Princes of Judah*, in respect of the Prince, who was to proceed from thence, by far superior to, and much more honourable than all the Kings of *Judah*. For as the *Romans* did not hire mercenary Troops, but led their own armed Citizens into the Field, and upon that Account divided their People into Centuries, so the *Israelites* had their Regiments consisting of a thousand Men, and those Cities were esteemed most honourable, which could furnish greatest Numbers of military Men. When therefore other Cities and Families of *Judah*, were able to lead forth to War their thousands of Men (in which Sense *Judg. vi. 15.* *Gideon* says, *my thousand* is the *meanest in Manasseh*, &c. And *Saul* seeking after *David*, flying and sculking, says, *If he be in the Land, I will search him out throughout all the thousands of Judah*, 1 *Sam. xxiii. 23.* as believing that he hid himself amidst those of his own Tribe,) on the contrary *Bethlehem* was too little to be reckon'd among the Cities of the Thousands of *Judah*, which used to furnish out thousands of Men for War: Which Periphrasis is properly made in this Place, where the Discourse is of Enemies, and Injuries sustained by War. But this City is mentioned by *St. Matthew* upon a quite different Account, as the Birth-place and Characteristick of the *Messiah*; in which respect it had the undoubted Preference over all the other Cities of *Judah*. Therefore as it was necessary for the Evangelist to deny it to be one of the least, so was it necessary to the Design and Context of the Prophet, for him to reckon it among the least
of

of the Cities in the Times he lived in. Which Things make it evident that both Readings are genuine, both true, and answering the Intent of the Holy Ghost; as we have intimated also above at N^o. xv. p. 113.

3. “ St. *John* [Ch. xix. 37.] hath it, ὅψον-
 “ ται, eis ὃν ἐξελέγησαν, *they shall look on him whom*
 “ *they have pierced*; on Account of which Words,
 “ Mr. *Whiston* chargeth Corruption upon the He-
 “ brew Copy, which at this Day reads thus :
 “ *Zech. xii. 10.* רָקַדוּ אֵלַי אֲרֵי אֲשֶׁר רָקַדוּ *they shall*
 “ *look unto me whom they have pierced*; now the
 “ following Words plainly shew, that these ought
 “ to be read in the third Person, by changing
 “ the Pronoun אֵלַי *Alaui, unto me*, into אֵלָיו *A-*
 “ *lav, unto him*, where the Lord, not speaking
 “ of himself, but of another in the third Person,
 “ thus proceeds: *And they shall lament for him,*
 “ *and they shall mourn bitterly for him.* More-
 “ over, since the LXX translate it, ἀντὶ ὧν κα-
 “ τὰς ἐχρήσατο, our Adversary cavils upon this
 “ last Word, and thinks that רָקַדוּ *Dakaru, they*
 “ *have pierced*, is put for רָקַדוּ *Rakadu, that is,*
 “ κατὰς ἐχρήσατο, *they insulted over.*

ANSW. Mr. *Whiston* is not beholden to his own Sagacity for either of these, but to the common Enemies of the Scripture, yea and of *Christ*, who long before him have urged those two Cavils. For the *Jews*, that they may not be compelled to admit those Things to be spoken of God, plead that אֵלָיו *Alav, unto him*, should be read for אֵלַי *Alaui, unto me*, as ^u they cite this Text, and as ^x *Rabbi Lipman* contends. *Socinus* also maintains, that in St. *John's* Time, it was not read אֵלַי *Alaui*, in the Prophet, or however, he

^u In Talmud. Tractat. סוּכָה Succah, cap. 5. fol. 52.

^x In Nezzachon ad h. l.

judges that Place to have been *accommodated* to *Christ* by *St. John*, according to such a Reading, as should not have the Word *אלי Alay*, that by this means the Words might appear not to have been spoken of the God of *Israel*. But the Observation of *Grotius* is of Use here, who thinks it comes all to the same, which ever way it be read: *For the first Person, especially when the relative follows after it, is in these Books, very often express'd by the third; which the frequent Enallage and Change of Persons in the Prophets fully proves.* Since then all Copies with unanimous Consent read it *אלי Alay*, to which is agreeable the *Greek* Version of the *LXX*, which hath it *πρός με, to me*, as also *Jonathan* and *Jerom*, we justly maintain this reading as true and genuine, neither shall we suffer another reading, supported by no Authority, to be obtruded upon us. Yea, the Context itself necessarily requires the present reading. For he who had just before promis'd in the first Person, that he would pour out the Spirit of Grace and Supplications upon the Family of *David* and the Inhabitants of *Jerusalem*, he it is who by the Particle *אלי Alay*, declares that himself was the Person to whom they were to look; neither does he advance to the Suffixes of the third Person *אלי Alav*, but by putting in the relative Pronoun *אשר Asher*, *that*, between them, thereby signifying very plainly that the same Subject, the same Person is spoken of, both in the first and third Person: Nothing can be clearer, so far as I conceive, than what I have now said.

As to the Complaint about the Word *דקרו Dakaru*, *γ Cappellus* formerly drew up the same against the Text: In answer to whom, some with

Coccejus and *Buxtorf*, suppose the *Greek* Interpreters from their own Conjecture to have put in *רקר* *Rakadu*, in order to make the Sense more intelligible; others with *Surenbusius* say, that the *Greek* Translators, in this Affair, had acted according to the Custom of the ancient *Jews*, who used to change Letters. that they might extort an allegorical Sense from the holy Scriptures: Others with *Conr. Kircher* think, that the Verb *רקר* *Rakad*, hath an Affinity to *רקר* *Dakar*, and that they differ but little in Sense: Others with ^z *Marc-kius* are of Opinion, that the Interpreters by their *κατωρχήσαντο*, intended a *piercing*, improperly so called, or an *insulting* going along with the *piercing*: Others with the very reverend ^a *Wolffius* say, that in this as in many other Places, they were deceived by the Similitude of the Letters *ר* *Resh* and *ד* *Dalet*, which gave Occasion to this Change of the Words: Lastly, others with ^b *Rich. Simonius* judge, that in the ancient and genuine Copies of the LXX, they formerly read *ἐξεκέντησαν*, *they pierced*, just as we have it now in *St. John*. The Authority of *St. John* is alone sufficient to us, which requires and establishesthe modern reading of the *Hebrew* Copies. Therefore, whatever may have been the Cause, that the *Greek* Interpreters erred, yet the Holy Ghost did not err in approving the reading *רקר* *Dakaru*, and explaining the genuine Sense of it by *ἐξεκέντησαν*, *they have pierced*.

4. " *St. Paul* quotes those Words from the " *Book of Psalms*, *Rom. x. 18. Their Sound went* " *into all the Earth, and their Words unto the Ends* " *of the World*: Which are both good Sense, " and still extant in the LXX, and were so also

^z *Ad h. l. Zach.* ^a *Cur. Philol. & Crit. in Joh. xix. 37.*

^b *Hist. Crit. de Textu. Nov. Test. p. 243.*

“ in the Days of ^c *Justin Martyr*, and in *Symmachus's Hebrew*. While the present *Hebrew* has it קוֹפ *Kavom*, *their Line* went into all the Earth, &c. without any apparent Sense at all, as used by the *Psalmist*; or any Pretence to an Agreement with the Coherence of the rest of the *Psalms*^d. And here, as before, the great Resemblance there is between the *Hebrew* Words for a *Line*, and a *Sound*, seems plainly to have given a Handle for this Alteration.

ANSW. The Agreement of those Places we shew'd a little before at N^o. xiv. p. 112. Now we observe, that as to the Sense, there is no Difference at all between them; only *St. Paul* spoke in a proper Word, what *David* had delivered in figurative Speech, and both of them equally answer to the Design and Coherence of the *Psalms*, so that this could be no Cause of Corruption. For a figurative Word was best adapted to the figurative Style of the *Psalms*, whereas a proper Word suited much better with *St. Paul's* plain simple Discourse: And this is the Reason, why the Apostle with the *Septuagint* Version speaks simply, *David* metaphorically, yet both having one and the same Sense. ^e *Pocock* reconciles the New with the Old Testament in this Place somewhat differently, but learnedly withal; largely and sedulously asserting and maintaining, from the *Arabick* way of speaking, that the Word קוֹפ *Kav* signifies a loud Cry or Noise, as well as a *Line* or *Rule*: By which Interpretation, the *Psalmist* and *St. Paul* will have said the same Thing*.

^c Dial. cum Tryph. p. 260. ^d Vid. Cappel. Crit. Sacr. iv. 17. v. 5. ^e Notis Miscellan. ad portam Moſis cap. 4. p. 48, &c. * Vitrina ſeems to have moſt clearly hiſ off every Difficulty relating to Pſal. xix. 5. compar'd with Rom. x. 18. He obſerves, that Cappellus's Pretence, that the LXX

v. " The same St. Paul, 1 *Corinth.* xv. 54. cites a Passage out of the Prophet *Isaiab*, thus: " τότε γλήσει ὁ λόγος γεσημμένος, κατεπόθη ὁ θάνατος εἰς νίκην, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in Victory, which agrees well enough with the Hebrew, in the modern reading of *Isa.* xxv. 8. " הוא יבלע המות בלע He will swallow up Death in Victory. But the *Septuagint* Copies have now, and had in the Days of *Origen*, instead thereof, κατέπιεν ὁ θάνατος ισχύσας, Death hath been prevalent, and devoured; clean contrary to the Scope of the Text, even in the same Version.

ANSW. But what have we to do with the *Greek* Translation? Will Mr. *Whiston* presume to correct a Text of the New Testament also from it? Let the *Greek* Version run as it will, so long as the Originals of both Testaments agree, they will confirm one another. Such frivolous Arguments will do the Author no Service.

6. " The Author to the *Hebrews* has a long Citation out of *Jeremiab*. In *Heb.* viii. 8, &c. In the 9th Verse after the LXX, He says καὶ γὰρ ἠμέλησα αὐτῶν, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord, which well agrees with the Context: But in *Jeremiab* quite contrary, the Words run thus, ואנכי בעלתי בם נאם יהוה and I ruled over them, saith the Lord, *Jer.* xxxi. 32. " The Similitude of the two *Hebrew* Words not

read קולם Kolam for קאם Kavam will not bear, since the LXX commonly render קול Kol, by φωνή, never by φῶγος. And as to קא, he observes, that it primarily signifies a Plummets, a Rule, and from thence any Rule or Direction given by Word of Mouth from a Master; and so *Psal.* xix. the Word is well render'd by φῶγος. See *Vitringa*, *Observat. Sacr.* Tom. 2. p. 841, &c. And upon *Isai.* xxviii. 10. p. 110. MOSES MARCUS.

§ In *Matt.* Edit. *Huet.* p. 295.

“ to regard, and to rule over, leave little Room
 “ to doubt how this Text came to be altered,
 “ unless with the learned Editor of the third Vo-
 “ lume of Dr. ^h Grabe's *Septuagint*, we suppose
 “ that even the present *Hebrew* will bear the o-
 ther Interpretation.

ANSW. Mr. *Whiston*, according to his usual Way, borrows this Accusation from ⁱ *Cappellus*, who throwing out the same Slander against the Text of *Jeremiah*, says, *so then the LXX read געלתי Gaalte*, by ג Gimel instead of ב Beth. But the Construction of the Verb with ב Beth, refutes this: For the Verb געל Gaal, will not admit of it, as is clear from *Levit. xxvi. 44.* and other Places. Therefore *Rabbi David Kimchi* giveth a much better Account, as he was taught by his Father: When at any time the Verb בעל Baal is construed with the Preposition ב Beth, שהוא לשון גנאי it signifies something vile, or is taken in a bad Sense. Upon this Consideration, in this Place, he will have בעלתי Baalte to be the same with בחלתי Bachalte, i. e. קצתי Katzte, *I have disdain'd, or have not regarded*, in which Sense we read the Verb בחל Bachal, *Zech. xi. 8.* And this is farther evident from *Jer. iii. 14.* Turn, O backsliding Children, saith the Lord, כי בעלתי בכם although I have rejected you, I will take you, &c. for he had said in the eighth Verse, that he had given a Bill of Divorce to backsliding *Israel*, rejected and forsaken by him because of their Adultery; a very plain Proof indeed of Contempt and Disregard. From all which it appears, that *Jeremiah* agrees with *St. Paul* in the same Sense exactly ^k.

^h Proleg. prop. 7. S. 27.
 S. 4. p. 266.

ⁱ Crit Sacr. Lib. 4. cap. 6.
^k If the Reader desires to see more upon these Texts, *Jer. xxxi. 32.* compared with *Heb. viii. 8.* he may among others consult *Gussetius*, in his *Vesperæ Groninganae*, p. 383, &c. where every thing of Moment relating thereto is

7. We read in the tenth Chapter, fifth Verse
 “ of the same Epistle of the *Hebrews*; *Sacrifice*
 “ and Offering thou wouldest not, *σῶμα ἡ ἀληθεία*
 “ *μοι*, but a Body hast thou prepared me. These
 “ Words give us the genuine Reading of the
 “ Text quoted, as agreeing to the *Saptuagint*
 “ Version and the *Roman* Psalter, and exceed-
 “ ing well answering the Scope and Coherence of
 “ the Psalm. But the present *Masoret* Copy has
 “ it quite otherwise, without any Sense, or Foun-
 “ dation in the Contexture of the Psalm, where
 “ they read it so, *Psal.* xl. 6. *אָזְנוֹתַי כְּרִיתָ לִי* *my*
 “ *Ears hast thou digged*. And this *Mr. Whiston*
 “ looks on as one of the absurdest of all the Jew-
 “ ish Alterations.

ANSW. This Quotation indeed differs in Words,
 but the Sense of both Texts remains the same;
 as we have already explain'd it at N^o. xv. p. 113.
 The Boring of the Ears was a Symbol of Servi-
 tude among the *Jews*, according to *Exod.* xxi. 6.
 and it belongs to *Christ*, in as much as he, the
 righteous Servant of God, hath completely fulfil-
 led all his Father's Will, *Psal.* xl. 8. And for this
 End he came into the World, and had a Body
 prepared by his Father, in which he might expiate
 the Iniquities of wicked Servants, *Isa.* lii. 13. liii.
 11. So that the Sense of *David's* Words amounts
 to this: *Thou hast made me thy Servant, obedient to*
thy Word, and most ready to perform thy Will. In
 which Sense the *Chaldee* paraphrases it, *אֶזְנוֹתַי לְפָנֶיךָ*
לִי *thou hast pierced [or opened] my*
Ears to hearken to thy Salvation. But the Cu-
 stom of Boring the Ear being altogether un-
 known to the *Greeks* and *Gentiles*, the LXX, by
 the Figure of *Synecdoche*, describes *Ears* by *σῶμα*

particularly considered, and the Greek and Hebrew Texts re-
 conciled. MOSES MARCUS.

a Body, and piercing, by the Verb καλαριζεν to prepare, in this Sense: *Thou hast artificially made and prepared a Body for me*, fit for thy Service, that I may be wholly, Soul and Body, dedicated and consecrated to thee. This implies the same with the Words of *David*. Although ¹ *Camero* thinks that σῶμα μοι, a Body for me, is put for σῶμα μου, my Body, and that some Impression upon the Body by certain Signs or Marks imprinted, is imported by the Word καλαρισμῶ, Preparation, of which this will be the Sense; *Thou hast prepared and marked my Body after a certain Manner*; as it was customary among the Greeks, to distinguish the Bodies of their Servants by some peculiar Mark. So that what *David* had described from the Jewish Custom, the Greek Interpreters illustrated from the Custom of the Gentiles: This we leave to the Reader to decide. I am not ignorant, that of the reformed *Alexander Morus*, and of our Communion ^m *Seb. Schmidius*, use their utmost Efforts to explode the Notion of an Allusion to the Rite used upon Servants. But as ⁿ *Braunius* hath given a satisfactory Answer to *Morus*, so if any one be moved by the Arguments of *Schmidius*, we yield, that it may hold good in the general Conception of the Phrase, that to pierce the Ears, is the same as if it had been said, to open, to make him obedient; as the *Messiah* speaks of himself, *Isa.* l. 4. *The Lord God hath opened mine Ear to hear, as the learned: ψ. 5. The Lord God hath open'd mine Ear, and I was not rebellious, neither turned away back.* By this nothing of the Sense is lost: But both *David* and *St. Paul* had good Reasons for the different Phrase used by each of them: *David* chiefly respected the Obedience of the *Messiah*,

¹ In Myrothec. ad h. l. Ebr. p. 277.
ⁿ Comment. in h. l.

^m In h. l. Ebr.

by which he offered up himself much more acceptable to his Father than all other Sacrifices, as is very clear from the Connexion of the 7th, 8th, and 9th Verses. But *St. Paul's* main Discourse is about the Sacrifice of the Body of *Christ*, as is evident from the whole Context, Ψ 1—10. but especially from the Apostle's Inference, Ψ 10. Therefore that symbolical Phrase about opening the Ear, best fitted the Scope and Coherence of the Psalm: The other Phrase, about preparing and offering his Body for a Sacrifice, agreed better with the Design of *St. Paul's* Argument. And thus, although both of them spake the same thing, yet each of them used a Phrase very applicable to their respective Contexts. Hence may we understand how prophane and absurd, I may justly say, how blasphemous *Mr. Whiston's* Censure is, by which he not only impeaches the Expression of the Holy Ghost in the Psalm, of Corruption, but pretends also that it contains the greatest Absurdity.

8. “ *St. James* in the most famous Council
 “ at *Jerusalem*, being to speak his Opinion, *Acts*
 “ xv. 16, 17. cites that Oracle of *Amos* ix. 11, 12.
 “ Now there is no Doubt, but that he expressed
 “ it after the same Manner, as the Jewish Copies
 “ read it in that Age: Yet it differs much from
 “ the modern *Hebrew*, especially in the last Verse
 “ spoken in these Words by *St. James*, *That the*
 “ *Residue of Men might seek after the Lord, and all*
 “ *the Gentiles, upon whom my Name is called, saith*
 “ *the Lord, who doth all these things.* *Amos* in the
 “ *Hebrew* reads it thus: *That they may possess the*
 “ *Remnant of Edom*, (or rather, *that they may*
 “ *obtain an Inheritance with the Remnant of Edom*)
 “ *and of all the Heathen, upon whom my Name is*
 “ *called, saith the Lord, that doth this.* *Mr. Whi-*
 “ *ston* declares this last Reading to be very par-
 “ tial

“ to the *Jews*, a gross Corruption of the original
 “ Text, contrary to good Sense, and to the De-
 “ sign of the Prophecy, and contradicting St.
 “ *James's* Quotation: And finally he calls it
 “ such a one, as can admit of no Excuse, and
 “ much less of any Defence.

ANSW. Here again our Author treads in the Footsteps of ° *Paul Pezron*, who with the same Views makes St. *James* and *Amos* contradict one another, that he may cast a Slur upon the *Hebrew* Text, as being corrupted. Indeed the reconciling of those two Places has cost the Learned a great deal of Labour; yet what we have said before at N°.xiv. p. 112. may contribute much towards reconciling the Difference, and rendering it plain and easy. For St. *James*, or St. *Luke*, followed the *Greek* Version, which differs widely from the Original in Words, but admirably well expresses the Meaning of the Prophecy. For whatever way the LXX read it, which is to us all the same, thus much however is plain and certain:

First, That the Tabernacle of *David*, in the prophetick Style, signifies the Kingdom of the *Messiah*, which is the Church of *Christ* who is often mentioned under the Name of *David* in the Old Testament; which Church was first to be constituted among the *Jews*, and from them to be spread among the Gentiles.

Secondly, That by the Name of *Edom*, the Enemies of the Church are to be understood P, as is plain from *Isa.* xxxiv. 5, 6. and lxii. 1.

° In *Antiquitate Temporum Defensâ*, cap. 5. p. 295, &c.

P This may be learned from our *Glassius*, who, *Rhetor. Sacr. Tr.* i. cap. 12. p. 372. says, *The Edomites, (most cruel Enemies to the Jews, Psal. cxxxvii. 7. Lament. iv. 21. Amos i. 2. Obad. v. 10. Ezek. xxv. 12.) are taken for any Enemies of the Church whatsoever.* MOSES MARCUS.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, That by *Israel*, to whom the Possession of an Inheritance with *Edom* is promised, is not to be understood obstinate, misbelieving, and rebellious, but spiritual *Israel*, τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ὁ Θεῖος, *The true Israel of God*, Gal. vi. 16. which was to come into the Communion of the Gentiles, upon whom the Name of the Lord was to be called^q.

Fourthly, That the Prophet's Words are not to be understood of the terrestrial Inheritance and Possession of *Idumea*, or of the corporal Subjection of that People, as the *Jews* would have it, but of the Conversion of the Nations most inveterate against the Church, to the Faith of *Christ*^r. These Things being premised, this is the obvious Sense of the Prophecy: The Time shall come, when the Residue of the Family or Kingdom of *David* shall be turned to their God, to the *Messiah*; i. e. those *Jews* who had formerly waited for the Hope of *Israel*, and together with them the Gentiles, hitherto Enemies to *Christ* and the true God; and thus by both the Tabernacle of *David*, which was fallen down, should be restored and enlarged, the Church being to be made up both of *Jews* and Gentiles. And therefore the Apostle St. *James* observing this to be fulfilled in his Time, he divulges and demonstrates the same by quoting this Prophecy of *Amos*: but following the *Greek* Translation, when with it he renders שְׂאֵרֵי אֶדְוֹם *Sharet Edom*, τὸν λοιπὸν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, *the Residue of*

^q Quod summe ven. Dn. D. Gebhardi docet in Vindiciis Hebræi Textus, adversus Pezronum, p. 182.

^r This Vitringa hath professedly proved, Observat. Sacr. Lib. 5. cap. 5. S. 11. p. 62, &c. where, industriously and with set Purpose, enquiring into this Place of *Amos*, he solidly demonstrates, that this Possession of *Edom* is spiritual, for that its Right arose from the Communion of Religion.

Men; and again, ירשו *Yarascheu*, ἐκζητήσωμεν ὃ κύριον, *might seek after the Lord*; he expresseth the same Sense with *Amos*, but withal makes the thing it self much clearer. Whence it is that **Edward Pocock* cannot be persuaded, that the Apostle and the *Greek* Interpreters, after whom he copied, “ read it any otherwise in ancient Times, than “ we at present do; or that they would have rendered it in other Terms, although they had been “ to translate it again, since as we have them already, they excellently open to us the secret “ Meaning of the Words, and discover to the “ Reader, that this is not so much to be understood of the earthly Inheritance of the Land of “ *Edom*, or the Conquest of that People, as of “ the Conversion of all Nations to the Faith of “ *Christ*; and that it does not speak of them to be “ subdued by *Christ* and his Apostles in any other “ Sense than by the Sword of the Word, or “ that they were to be put under any other Yoke, “ but the Discipline of *Christ*, to whom the Ends “ of the Earth are given for an Inheritance; so “ that they being taught the Doctrine of the “ Kingdom of Heaven, all of them with unanimous Consent might seek after the Lord, and “ give up their Names to him.

These Objections, together with what we shall presently hear from Mr. *Whiston*, against the Authenticity of the *Canticles*, are in a manner all that directly attack the Perfection of the *Hebrew* Copy. In the refuting of which, we have been so much the more prolix, because we thought a great Scandal would be thereby given to the Weak, and a grievous Reproach thrown upon the Holy Scriptures. In the remaining Articles we shall be more concise, since we have already

anticipated many Things in what has been said above, which if prudently applied, may take off every Cavil of the Adversary.

C H A P. III.

Of the State and Condition of the Septuagint Greek Translation, in ancient and modern Copies.

PROPOSITION II. *Page 3.*

The Greek Version of the Old Testament, called the Septuagint Version, as it stood in the Days of Christ and his Apostles; was agreeable to the genuine Hebrew Text, as it was in that Age.

WHICH Affirmation he endeavours to prove, *First*, “ From the natural Genius
 “ of Translations, which ought to agree perfectly with their Original. *Secondly*, From
 “ the Nature of the sacred Books, which bound
 “ up their Interpreters by strong Obligations
 “ of Religion, not to recede from the Original. *Thirdly*, from the common Approbation
 “ both of the ancient *Jews* and the primitive Christians, with which they received this
 “ Version, as conformable to the authentick original Text, and both of them read it with the
 “ greatest Reverence in their publick sacred Offices. *Fourthly*, From the Testimonies of *Aristeas*, *Philo*, and *Josephus*, wherein they commend the accurate Fidelity and Harmony of
 “ the

“ the Translation of the *Pentateuch*. *Fifthly*,
 “ From the Opinion of the ancient *Jews*, who
 “ were so fully persuaded of the Agreement of
 “ the Translation with its Original, that they
 “ pretended the Interpreters were divinely inspi-
 “ red. *Sixthly*, From the Consent of all who
 “ quoted the Old Testament before the second
 “ Century, partly of *Philo* and *Josephus*, partly of
 “ *Christ* and his Apostles, who when they cite the
 “ Texts, suppose that there is only one Reading,
 “ one Copy, without the least Sign of their
 “ knowing any Difference between the Original
 “ and the *Greek* Texts. *Seventhly*, From the Si-
 “ lence of the Enemies of the Christian Religion,
 “ who could not have failed to impeach the Cita-
 “ tions made by Christians from this Version, of
 “ Falsity and Disagreement, if at that Time it
 “ had departed from the Original. *Eighthly*,
 “ From the tacit Confession of the *Jews* of that
 “ Age, that these Quotations corresponded with
 “ their Original, because by them chiefly it was,
 “ that so great Numbers of them were persuaded
 “ to believe the Truths of Christianity. *Ninthly*,
 “ From the Harmony of the Apostolical Cita-
 “ tions, with the *Samaritan Pentateuch*, and the
 “ *Roman Psalter*, which are the only Books of
 “ the whole Body of the Old Testament, which
 “ have been transmitted to us without Corrup-
 “ tion.

If I must give my Judgment of those Things, I
 cannot altogether deny, that in the Time of *Christ*
 and the Apostles, the Copies of the *Greek* Tran-
 slation were more correct, and for that Reason it
 came nearer to the *Hebrew* Original in that Age,
 than either in the next Age, when the Pale of the
 Church being enlarged all over the World, it
 came to be so often transcribed; or than it is at
 present, after a Course of so many Ages, and so
 many

many Casualties upon Literature and ancient Books, having undergone considerable Changes, and having put on a quite different Face, especially by means of the Works of *Origen*; so that in our Copies we cannot easily tell in many Places, what Part of the ancient Translation hath remained whole, nor what Patches out of *Symmachus* and *Theodotion*, have thrust out the primitive Text from its Place. Yet we do not therefore grant to Mr. *Whiston*, that at that Time the *Greek* Version represented the *Hebrew* Text in every thing to a Tittle, that both Readings and both Copies might be looked upon as one. For the Interpreters, in preparing their Version, indulged themselves the Liberty of varying often considerably from the Original, contenting themselves with giving the Sense; which whether in every Place they rightly apprehended, being *Alexandrian Jews*, still remains under Debate, neither can it at this Day be determined: But they certainly used great Liberty in Words and Phraseology, as may be understood from what we have elsewhere[†] evidently demonstrated on that Subject. As also afterwards, even to *Christ's* Time, neither did all the Copists, nor Criticks, nor even Interpreters, treat this Translation with such religious Fidelity and Care, as to make all the Copies exactly answer to its Original and its primitive Reading. The very learned Dr. ^v*Grabe*, in his Dissertation upon the many Corruptions crept into the Translation of the LXX Interpreters, before the Days of *Origen*, hath proved to a Demonstration, that Interpolations, Omissions, Transpositions, and finally Corruptions of very many Texts in this Translation, had been brought in before the Age of our Saviour himself; and he

[†] Crit. Sacr. part. 2. c. 2. S. 6. 'Ex. 9. 3.

‡ Cap. I.

hath

hath also discovered and declared the Sources and Causes of them. And this is the Reason, why we absolutely deny Mr. *Whiston's* Proposition.

And indeed it finds but very slender Protection from those Considerations, under Support of which the Author has sent it abroad. For, *First*, the natural Genius of Translations, which he pleads in its Favour, is so far from countenancing his *Hypothesis*, that it rather evidently demonstrates the contrary. For since every Language hath its own Propriety, its peculiar Turn and Idiom, which no other can imitate or exactly render, much less can That which is so far distant from the Original, as the *Greek* is from the *Hebrew*; hence it is, that no Translation whatsoever can altogether come up to the Original Text, or so perfectly express it, as that both of them should pass but as one Reading, and one Copy. This might be easily made good by Examples. But that we may not wander too far from our Purpose, we much admire Mr. *Whiston's* Logick, by which he concludes, because every Version ought to be exactly conformable to its Original, that therefore it necessarily follows that the *Greek* Translation in *Christ's* Time was precisely agreeable to the *Hebrew* Text in every Particular: For to argue from *Right* to *Fact*, and even to the minutest Circumstances of it, is like twisting a Rope of Sand, or like matching Round and Square.

Secondly, Neither is he at all more happy in his second Argument, taken from the Nature of the sacred Books. For the Thing to be proved was, not what ought to have been done, but what actually was done as to this Translation. We are not now upon determining a Right, but we are discussing a Fact. Although I need not mention that such is the Nature and Quality of the
sacred

sacred Books, that both because of the Sublimity of the Mysteries, which they deliver, as also for the Diversity of subject Matter, and of the *Hebrew* Style, that they cannot be so completely render'd into any other Language, as to make it all one whether you read them in the Original, or in the Translation. Yea farther, that the LXX Elders (as they are called) did not so very exactly translate the original Text into *Greek*, may be strongly argued from the other Versions, which *Aquila*, *Symmachus*, *Theodotion*, and others drew up after it: For they might have spared their Labour, had there been nothing wanting in this which had been already extant and well known some Ages before. *Aquila's* Translation, whatever Design he had in it, is certainly esteemed by *Jerom* and *Origen*, much nearer to the *Hebrew* Phrase; whose Testimonies to this Purpose, we formerly produced elsewhere *. Whence I think it evident, that the Version of *Aquila* is by far preferable, to the *Septuagint*, as to its Agreement with the Original.

Thirdly, As to the reading of the *Septuagint* in the publick Assemblies, which was done by the *Jews* living in *Egypt* and out of *Palestine*, and by the primitive Christians; it was not its Conformity with the *Hebrew*, but pure Necessity which obliged them to it. Neither of them understood *Hebrew*, but both knew the *Greek*; wherefore it was necessary for them to use that Language in their publick Assemblies, which they all understood. And That was the *Greek* which *Alexander the Great*, together with his Victories and Empire, had spread through all *Asia*, and almost over the whole East. Therefore it is no wonder if the *Alexandrian*, commonly called the *Septuagint*

* Crit. Sacr. part. 2. cap. 3. S. 2. 'Exo. 2.

Version, had the Preference in sacred Offices in the first Century, when no other *Greek* Version was yet extant.

Fourthly, That *Aristeas* of *Josephus*, hath long since lost all Credit and Reputation, so that no Man will readily submit to his Authority and Testimony. Neither are *Philo* and *Josephus* sufficient Judges, or Witnesses, of the Conformity between the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Text: One of them was ignorant of the *Hebrew*, and could not consult the Original of the Old Testament; the other frequently differs both from the *Greek* Version and the *Hebrew* Copy, following his own Fancy, and regards not how truly he writes, as how it may fit his Purpose, or may suit the Taste of his Readers.

Fifthly, Moreover as to the Judgment of the *Jews*, if it was sometimes favourable, it was also often times quite contrary with respect to this Version: Nor were they all of them consistent with one another, or thought the same way; as may be understood from what *we* have elsewhere said upon that Subject; so that from thence can be drawn no firm Conclusion.

Sixthly, Upon the same Account it were no wonder if *Christ* and his Apostles had always quoted this Version, were the Thing true which *Mr. Whiston* here asserts with so much Confidence: But the inspecting into and comparing the Texts cited out of the Old Testament, with the *Septuagint*, refutes this Figment, and plainly shews, that the Writers of the New Testament, at one time followed the *Alexandrian* Version, at other times when it was not apposite enough, they took another in its stead, which was nearer to the Original. *Mr. Whiston* indeed in these

Places, supposes the Quotations of this kind to be the Remains of the first and uncorrupted Version, as they read it before it was tamper'd with. But this he says by Conjecture only, without any authentick Vouchers, or convincing Reasons; and so it is begging the Question. In the preceding Chapter, we have said all that is needful to be said, upon such Quotations.

Seventhly, Neither doth the Consent of the Enemies of the Truth do him any Service, since none of their Writings, wherein they opposed the Books of the New Testament in the first Century, are now remaining. So that no Man can tell at this Day, whether they allowed the Agreement of the *Greek* Version with the *Hebrew* Bible, or whether they reproach'd the Christians with their Disagreement.

Eighthly, Furthermore the Conversion of the *Jews* was not owing to the perfect Agreement of both Copies, but to the intrinsick Efficacy of God's Word, which goes not along with the Language, but with the Sense of the Scripture; which therefore by a Translation also works its Effect upon the Minds of Men. Hence it was that when the Apostle *Peter*, immediately after the Descent of the Holy Ghost, preached to the promiscuous Multitude, gathered together, [*Acts* ii. 14, &c.] he recited the Texts of the Prophets so often quoted, not indeed in *Greek* from the *Septuagint*, but doubtless in the *Syro-Chaldaick* Dialect; yet by their Means he convinced and persuaded three thousand of his Hearers to give up their Names to *Christ*. Besides, when the Apostles preached in the *Greek* Language, that Version might differ in above a thousand Places from the *Hebrew*, and yet not one of them be cited either in their Sermons or Writings, for convincing the *Jews*.

Ninthly and lastly, As to what belongs to the Samaritan Pentateuch and Roman Psalter, it shall be considered in a Chapter by itself.

HIS PROPOSITION IV. P. 112. runs thus :

The modern Copies of the Septuagint Version, since the second Century, especially since the Days of Origen, are also considerably different from those genuine Hebrew and Greek Copies, which were extant in the first Century, in the Days of Christ and his Apostles.

MR. *Whiston* is over lavish of his Labour, when he endeavours to inform us by Examples, and to convince us by plain Testimonies, that Corruptions have crept into the *Greek Version* since the Days of *Origen*. No knowing Man ever denied that, and ² we have not only granted and ^a demonstrated it, but ^b we have endeavour'd also to search into and discover the Causes of those Corruptions. Nevertheless with all his long Train and wide Compass of Words he hath not yet proved, *First*, That the *Greek Copies* have suffer'd this Corruption from the Middle of the second Century. *Secondly*, And that it proceeded from a fraudulent Contrivance of the *Jews*, to overturn the genuine Reading of the Scripture. *Thirdly*, That the Reading of the *Greek Copies* in the Age of *Christ* and his Apostles, exactly answer'd to the *Hebrew Original*. But unless all these Particulars can be proved by solid Arguments, he will make no Advantage to his *Hypothesis*, by charging Corruption upon the *Greek*

² Pag. 2. cap. 2. S. 2.

^a Ex. 2.

^b Ex. 3.

Version,

Version, which could never have the Perfection which is proper to the original Text. Wherefore there is no Necessity for us to take any farther Pains in discussing this Proposition. *Again to this Head belongs*

PROPOSITION VII. P. 172.

The present Septuagint Version of the Psalms of David, especially as still preserved in its most ancient Latin Version the Roman Psalter, is a faithful and uncorrupt Copy of that sacred Book, as it stood both in the Hebrew and Greek Copies of the first Century.

“ **T**HIS he pretends to prove from the ex-
 “ act Conformity of the *Greek Version*,
 “ especially of the *Roman Psalter* in the *Italick*
 “ Translation, with the large and frequent Cita-
 “ tions of *Christ*, his *Apostles*, their *Companions*,
 “ and the earliest *Fathers*. The *Book of Psalms*
 “ is almost the only one of all the *Old Testa-*
 “ *ment* which escaped Corruptions, because the
 “ singing of *Psalms* made up a great Branch of
 “ divine Worship, from the first Beginning of
 “ Christianity, both among the *Greeks* and *Latins*.
 “ The constant Use of the *Psalms* so fixed them
 “ in the Memories of Christian People, that if a-
 “ ny Man had attempted to obtrude new Copies,
 “ or new Versions, all Christians could easily de-
 “ tect the Variations made, and throw them
 “ out.

ANSW. Mr. *Whiston* here forms his Argument upon the *Hypothesis* which he hath laid down, but has not yet proved. For granting it to be as he would have it, that the *Italick Version* of the *Roman Psalter* hath come to our Hands the most

pure and uncorrupt of all the holy Books, yet from thence it does not irrefragably follow,

First, That it exactly agreed with the *Greek* Text, and that the *Greek* with the like Fidelity and Integrity was consonant to the *Hebrew*, so as to make it all one in every respect, whether you read the *Hebrew* or the *Greek*, or finally, the *Latin* Psalter. Which that it cannot possibly be, we have a little before shewn, from the different Idioms of these Languages, from the unequal Abilities of Interpreters, and from the Nature and Condition of all Versions.

2. Moreover, *Secondly*, What Mr. *Whiston* with great Confidence takes for granted, we can by no means admit of, that the *Septuagint* Translation in the second Century, which is the Time he fixes for the *Italick* Version's being taken from it, remained yet uncorrupted, and without any Blemish: This we not only denied before at the *ii^d* Proposition, but the same is refuted from the Diversity of the Citations, by different Authors of that Age: For Example, from *Zech. xiii. 7.* quoted by St. *Mark* *xiv. 27.* we thus read it: Παράξω τὸ ποιμνία, καὶ ἀσκορπισθήσεται τὰ πρόβατα, *I will smite the Shepherd, and the Sheep shall be scattered.* In *Matth. xxvi. 31.* this is a little fuller; Τὰ πρόβατα τὸ ποιμνός, *The Sheep of the Fold.* And it is still larger in the Catholick Epistle of *Barnabas*, Τότε σκορπισθήσεται τὰ πρόβατα τὸ ποιμνός, *Then the Sheep of the Fold shall be scattered.* Again, St. *Paul* thus reads the last Words of the 16th Verse of the xxviii of *Isa.* in *Rom. ix. 33.* Καὶ πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ἐν αὐτῷ, καὶ καταισχυνθήσεται, *And whosoever believeth on him, shall not be ashamed.* St. *Peter*, 1 Epist. ii. 6. Καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐν αὐτῷ, καὶ καταισχυνθήσεται, *And he that believeth in him, shall not be confounded.* *Barnabas* in his Epistle formerly cited, Καὶ ὁς ἐλπίζει ἐν αὐτῷ, ζήσει εἰς τὸ αἶωνα, *And he who shall hope*

hope in him, shall live for ever. But because here we are chiefly treating of the Psalter, I observe that Passages of the Psalter are also quoted variously, and with great Diversity. For Example, ^c Justin Martyr thus reads the last Words of the 12th Verse of the xlv Psalm; καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν αὐτῷ, and they shall worship him. But on the other hand he ^d elsewhere agrees twice with the Hebrew; καὶ προσκυνήσεις αὐτῷ, and thou shalt worship him. From Psal. xviii. 44. ^e Justin reads it, εἰς ἀκουὼν ὡτίς ᾤκησέν με, he obeyed me with the Hearing of the Ear; ^f Barnabas hath in the Plural Number, ᾤκησαν με, they obeyed me. Again ^g Justin is not constant to himself: Quoting Psal. lxxii. 3. he reads, Ἀναλαβέτω τὰ ὄρη εἰρήνῃ τῷ λαῷ, but ^h elsewhere, Ἀναλαβέτωσαν τὰ ὄρη τῷ λαῷ εἰρήνῃ, And let the Mountains bring Peace to the People. And in the 19th Verse ⁱ he says thus; Εὐλογήμενον τὸ ὄνομα ^κ δόξης αὐτοῦ εἰς ^λ αἰῶνα, καὶ εἰς ^μ αἰῶνα τῷ αἰῶνι, Blessed be his glorious Name for ever, and for ever and ever: Yet ^k more concisely, Εὐλογητὸν τὸ ὄνομα ^κ δόξης αὐτοῦ εἰς ^λ αἰῶνα τῷ αἰῶνι, Blessed be his glorious Name for ever and ever. From Psal. l. 18. ^l Justin reads it, Εἰ θεώρεις κλέπτῃ, σωτέρεχες αὐτῷ, ἢ μετὰ μοιχῇ ^μ μερίδα σε ἐτίθεις, When thou sawest a Thief, thou consentedst with him, and hast been Partaker with the Adulterer: But ⁿ Clement omits the Word αὐτῷ, with him; and reads, μετὰ μοιχῶν, with Adulterers, in the Plural Number. And again Justin, in ^ν 21. reads, Ἐλέγξω σε, ἢ παραστήσω ^ξ πρόσωπόν σε τὰς ἀμαρτίας σε, I will reprove thee, and set thy Sins before thy Face; but Clement thus, Παραστήσω σε ^ξ πρόσωπόν σε, I will set thee before thy Face. In ^ν 22. Ignatius hath it, μὴ ποτὲ ἀπαίσῃ,

^a Dialog. cum Tryph. p. 112. Edit. Londinens. 8^o An. 1719. ^d P. 190, 191. ^e C. l. p. 82. ^f Cit. Epist.

^g Dial. pag. 97.

^h P. 194.

ⁱ P. 98.

^k P. 194.

^l Dial. p. 67.

ⁿ Epist. i. ad Corinth. c. 35.

καὶ ἔμὴ ὁ ῥυόμην, *lest he tear, and there be no Deliverer*: Clement thus; μὴ ποτὲ ἀρπάσῃ ὡς λέων, καὶ μὴ ὁ ῥυόμην *least he tear as a Lion, &c.* Verse 23. καὶ ἐκεῖ ὁδὸς, ἣ δείξω αὐτῷ τὸ σωτήριόν μου, *and there is the way by which I will shew him Salvation*: Clement, καὶ ἐκεῖ ὁδὸς ἣν δείξω αὐτῷ τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ, *and this is the Way, according to which I will shew him the Salvation of God.* In *Psal. xix. 3.* ἢ *Justin* reads, οὐκ εἰσὶ λαλιαὶ, ἔδὲ λόγοι, *there are neither Speeches, nor Languages.* ° Clement inverts the Order: ἔ οὐκ εἰσὶ λόγοι, ἔδὲ λαλιαὶ, *and there are neither Languages, nor Speeches.* A Multitude of such Differences might be produced, if a Thing so clear of it self needed any tedious Demonstration: But what we have said is sufficient to shew the Weakness of Mr. *Whiston's* Proof. For if the Writers of the N. Testament, and the Fathers of the first and second Century, did not every where quote the Texts of the *Greek* Translation, in one and the same Tenour of Words, it is altogether wrong to conclude, from such falsely supposed Conformity, that the *Greek* Copies agreed at that Time. But neither

3. *Thirdly*, Is that *Italick* Version now extant entire, neither has there been seen at this Day by Mr. *Whiston* or any Person whatsoever, any such as was read in the first Centuries. For that which *Flamin. Nobilius* hath patch'd together, from many Scraps of the Fathers, is so far from making up the *Italick*, that by the Testimony of *Huetius*, in it you may read any other Version rather than the true *Italick*. This is clear from what we have proved elsewhere P. But if in the Days of *Augustin* and *Jerom*, it was no longer pure, nor was read the same way, which both of

° P. 195. ° Epist. I. ad Corinth
part. 2. cap. 6. S. 2. *Exl. I.*

¶ Crit. Sacr.

them so often complain of, and which the different Manner of expressing the same Sentences, in different Works of the Fathers proves, who can this Day warrant it free from Corruption? From hence I presume it is, that Mr. *Whiston*, contrary to his Custom, hath not shewn this pretended Agreement by so much as a single Instance.

C H A P. IV.

Of the Divine Original of the Song of Songs, and its Canonical Authority.

SUCH is Mr. *Whiston's* Eagerness in Slandering, that he could not be content with weakening the Authority of the Old Testament in smaller Parcels, or with rendering it doubtful in one or two Places, or with wounding it obliquely, or charging it sidewise, unless he directly also attacked some entire Book, endeavouring to the utmost to deprive and disrobe it of all its Dignity, and to thrust it out from the Canon of the divinely inspired Scriptures. With this Intent, in the Year 1723, he published a *Supplement to his Essay* at London in 8°. which succeeding to his other most pernicious Work, might give the finishing Stroke: The whole Tendency of it was, to render odious amongst all, the divine Song of *Solomon*, eminently so called, and to declare it altogether unworthy to have had God for its Author. Upon this Occasion he has vomited up all his Gall, and hath omitted no Accusation, nor Colour, whereby to bring down this sublime Book, full of lofty and sacred Mysteries, from the high Rank

Rank of divine Inspiration, and from the honourable Place it holds among the canonical Scriptures. Two Persons have undertaken to answer him; one of the *English* a noted Man, *William Itchener*, M. A. Rector of *Christian Malsford, Wilts.*, in *A Defence of the Canon of the Old Testament: or, An Answer to Mr. Whiston's Supplement to his late Essay*, Lond. Anno 1723, in 12°. And of the *Germans*, the learned *Nicol. Nonnenius*, Minister of the Gospel at *Bremen*, who in his Inauguration Speech for Doctor of Divinity's Degree, publicly maintain'd the *Thesis* about the *Canonical Authority of the Song of Songs*, at *Utrecht* Anno 1725. But as I have not hitherto had Opportunity of perusing or seeing either of those Performances, I cannot pass my Judgment of what either of them has done. But in the Year 1724, as I was offering to the Publick a *Vindication of the sacred Code*, which I had drawn up against Mr. *Whiston*, I undertook to examine within the Compass of a few Sheets all his trifling Pretences of that *Supplement*; and I have, as I hope, briefly, but fully shewn, how to answer the Adversary. And now as the Argument I am upon, and the Office I bear, seem to require of me, I shall hither transfer what Things I then offered, and here repeat them.

This is Mr. *Whiston's* single

PROPOSITION.

The Book of Canticles is not a sacred Book of the Old Testament, nor ever held for such, either by the Jewish or Christian Church.

“ i. **F**OR, says he, *Solomon* did not compose
 “ this Book in his younger Years, while
 “ he

“ he led a good Life, free from Wickedness,
 “ and frequently and seriously worshipped Al-
 “ mighty God; but long afterwards, when sunk
 “ in Pleasures, he had given himself up whole to
 “ Idolatry.” This Mr. *Whiston* pretends to prove
 by one general Argument to this Effect: “ If
 “ *the Book of Canticles is full of Wisdom and Piety,*
 “ *we must then by all Means suppose, that Solomon*
 “ *writ it in his Youth, when as yet he was Wise and*
 “ *Religious: But, on the other hand, if it be stuf-*
 “ *fed with Folly, Vanity, and Looseness, from*
 “ *beginning to the end, as it certainly is, then we*
 “ *must conclude, that Solomon writ it in his Old*
 “ *Age.*” But besides that this Scoff is injurious
 to the Spirit of God, the Supream Author of this
 Book, and is nearly bordering upon Blasphemy,
 and not so proper to be corrected by the Pen of
 the Learned, as by the severer Censure of the
 Civil Magistrate; our Adversary’s Conclusion is
 evidently false. Might not *Solomon* before his
 Death return to a better Mind, and change his
 impure Amours, which he had before doated up-
 on, for Loves refined, and full of Mysteries?
 We are perswaded upon weighty Reasons and
 Considerations, that he not only might, but that
 he actually did return to a better Mind; and
 having by Prayer to God, obtained Pardon for
 his past Sins, ended his Days piously and happily.
 For in 1 *Kings* xi. 43. he is said to have *slept*
with his Fathers, which Phrase is rightly judged
 by Divines, not so much to imply a common
 Sepulchre, as a Communion in Faith and Holi-
 ness. And the good Beginning of *Rehoboam’s*
 Reign, is said to have been both like to *David*
 and *Solomon*, 2 *Chron.* xi. 17. where if he had
 died impenitent, he had not probably been join’d
 with his penitent and religious Father. And we
 have in another Place made it out, that he writ
Cobeleth,

Cobeletb, or *Ecclesiastes*, towards the End of his Life, after he had renounced the World and all its Vanities, and retained nothing but a Disdain and Contempt of Pleasures. And that he was an illustrious Type of our Saviour, is manifest from the Testimony of *Christ* himself, *Matth.* xii. 42. and other Arguments: All which Things that they no wise suit with an impenitent Person, and one condemned to infernal Punishments, is clearer than the Sun. Yet we cannot therefore be persuaded to refer the Composition of the *Canticles*, to the decrepit old Age of this wisest of Kings, although brought back to a religious Course, and reconciled to God: For, his flowing and luxuriant Style, adorned with so many Figures, set off with such Variety of Colours, turned so many different ways, and even the Poetical Frame of it, make it plain that the Writer's Fancy was not broken and worn out with old Age, but they shew a strong and sprightly Genius. For the Diction of old Men, is too dry, severe, and concise, to admit of that Luxuriancy of Style, which so visibly prevails throughout the *Canticles*. From which Consideration we may make a probable Conjecture in Favour of his younger Years, in which a Man's Invention flourishes with his Age, and his Style with his Invention. Moreover, what Part of *Solomon's* Life could be more fit to sing the spiritual Loves between *Christ* and his Church, than that, when enflam'd with the same Love, *2 Sam.* xii. 25, he was called ידידב *Yadidjab*, beloved of the Lord, בעבור יהוה *Baavur Jehovah*, because of the Lord, for whom he had a sincere and hearty Affection, and of whose singular Favour he had had so happy Experience? What Time more likely than that, when he has said to have excelled in Songs, *1 Kings* iv. 32. being full of Divine Wisdom? Finally, what Part
of

of his Life was more proper than that, when being unpolluted with the immodest Embraces of strange Women, he came with a Mind holy and pure, to the Description he was to give of the most chaste Espousals of the Messiah? For these, and other Reasons, we have for a good while past rested in this Opinion, that *Solomon*, when in the Prime of his Age, and as yet sincerely devoted to the Service of God, when he was busied in preparing and setting up the Manner of divine Worship, and in ordering the Musical Choir, then among other Hymns compos'd by his Father, which were design'd for the publick Use of the Church, he taking into his more serious Consideration, that most mysterious *xlv Psalm*, about the spiritual Espousals of *Christ* with his Church, by divine Instinct, resolv'd with himself to draw it out more largely and elegantly, and to make a kind of Commentary upon that spiritual Epithalamium, or Marriage-Song, that he might more fully decypher the Secrets of that most sacred Love, and might more compleatly inform, not only the *Jewish* Synagogue, but the Church also in all Ages to come about this high Mystery, far surpassing human Understanding. Which Opinion, although it still very well pleaseth me, I desire not to press upon any other Man that can shew me any Thing more certain, concerning the Occasion, upon which *Solomon* applied his Mind to the Composure of this Divine Poem: Yet this we are very sure of, that it had the Holy Ghost for its Author, is of Heavenly and Divinely-inspired Original, and that it sings only Chaste and Pure Mysteries; neither doth it contain any thing unbecoming either the Majesty of Canonical Scripture, or the Character of the wisest King, nor yet the serious Meditation of Learned and Godly Men. Yet that our

Adver-

Adversary may not boast, that he hath done something considerable in attacking the Authority of this most sacred Book, we shall in a few Words, and in due Order, examine by what Pretences he endeavours to colour over his Accusations. His first Pretence is, that *Solomon* writ the *Canticles*, while he was enslaved to Luxury and Pleasures : And of this he thinks he hath found evident Tokens in the very Text. For Example,

1. Chap. i. 9. “ Where *Solomon’s* Wife is compar’d to a very fine Sett of Horses, joined in
 “ *Pharaoh’s* Chariot. For although God, *Deut.*
 “ xvii. 16, had solemnly prohibited the King of
 “ *Israel*, that he should not multiply Horses, and
 “ bring back the People into Egypt, to the end that
 “ he should multiply Horses to himself; yet the Scripture often testifies, that *Solomon* despised this
 “ Prohibition, 1 *Kings* x. 28, &c. 2 *Chron.* i. 16.
 “ ix. 28. 1 *Kings* iv. 26. x. 25, &c. Since then
 “ *Solomon* advanc’d in Years, and flowing in Voluptuousness and Luxury, multiplied Horses
 “ and Chariots to himself, hence it is most likely,
 “ that he also in the same Space of Time, writ
 “ the *Canticles*, in which he so often alludes to
 “ that great Number of Chariots and Horses,
 “ which he had multiplied against the Command
 “ of God.

There are almost as many Incoherencies in this Argument of Mr. *Whiston*, as there are Commas, or Sentences. For observe how these Things hang together: *Solomon* draws a Comparison from *Pharaoh’s* Horses and Chariots; therefore he provided them late in his old Age; therefore, in the *Canticles*, he had a View to them, so bought up in his declining Years; therefore he compos’d the *Canticles*, while immers’d in Pleasures. But might he not, upon his first setting up Royal Grandeur, have bought

bought up some few Chariots and Horses out of *Egypt*, and allude to them in this Place? Certain it is, that we read of *Absalom* when he usurped the Kingdom, that he provided Chariots and Horsemen, 2 *Sam.* xv. 1. and that when *Adonijah* attempted Innovations he did the same, 1 *Kings* i. 5. Who then can doubt but that *Solomon*, lest he should appear inferior to them, did about the Beginning of his Reign, take upon him as much State as they, but still keeping himself within the Bounds of Moderation? Neither did the divine Prohibition hinder him: For ⁹ *Guil. Schickard* hath shewn, that the Sense of it is not, that the King of *Israel* should wholly refrain from keeping of Horses, but that he should have but few. When afterwards this ambitious and voluptuous King too much increas'd the Number, and was lavish in his Expences upon them, no doubt but he transgress'd enormously against the Law of God: But it can no way be prov'd, that it was at that particular time, he at length wrote the *Canticles*. Finally, excepting the Place cited, I find no mention made of Horses, and but once more of a Chariot, ch. vi. 11. in all this Book; so that from thence there is no reason to conclude, that *Solomon's* Stables were so plentifully furnish'd, or were in such high Repute, at the time when the *Canticles* were compos'd.

2. " The Chariots of *Aminadab* are spoken of, " ch. vi. 12. This Place insinuates, not only that " at that time, Chariots were famous, and that " they were much used in *Judea*, (which we meet " with only once before, since the Days of *Moses*, " 2 *Sam.* viii. 4. 1 *Chron.* xviii. 4.) but also that " the Chariots of *Aminadab* were more famous, " and much better known than others. Now

⁹ In Jure Regio Hebr. cap. 3. Theor. 10.

" *Amini-*

“ *Aminadab* was one of those twelve Rulers of
 “ Provinces, who had married *Tapbath* the King’s
 “ Daughter, 1 *Kings* iv. 11, therefore when *Solo-*
 “ *mon* had Daughters married, and the Chariots
 “ and Horses of his Son-in-law were so celebrated,
 “ that they became proverbial, he could not be
 “ a young Man, when he compos’d the *Canticles*.

ANSW. Mr. *Whiston* confounds Round with Square, and blends together Names and Persons that are most widely different, to come at his Point. In this Place are named מרכבוֹר עמי נדיב *Marcabot Gnami Nadib*, the Chariots of my willing People; but our Adversary, taking it for a proper Name instead of an Appellative, renders it *Aminadab*; possibly carried into that Mistake, by Authority of the *Septuagint* and vulgar *Latin*. Now since we find many *Aminadabs* mention’d in Scripture before the Age of *Solomon*, one the Father-in-Law of *Aaron*, whose Daughter named *Elisheba* he took to Wife, *Exod.* vi. 23. Another, one of *David*’s Progenitors, the Son of *Ram*, the Father of *Nachson*, *Ruth* iv. 9. who is made Mention of in the Genealogy of *Christ*, *Matth.* i. 4. A third in the Time of *David*, chief of the Levites, 1 *Chron.* vi. 22. but we read of none of that Name in the Time of *Solomon*. Mr. *Whiston* thinks *Aminadab* to be the same Name with אֲבִינָדָב *Abinadab*, *Solomon*’s Son-in-law, 1 *King.* iv. 11. which Name in the Derivation, and Spelling, and Signification, much differs from the other. *Aminadab* signifies my willing People: *Abinadab* imports the Father of a free Man, or one who lives in a state of Freedom: the one is compounded from גַּם *Gnam*, People, the other from אֲבִי *Ab*, a Father; the one is written with the initial Letter י *Ain*, the other by אֵ *Aleph*: So that no Man who has but learn’d the first Elements of *Hebrew*, can take them for one and the same Name. But
 1 after

after all, what have any of those Things to do with our Text, in which there are two appellative Words, distinguished in the Writing, both as to the blank Space and Accent? Certain it is, that all the *Greek* Interpreters, excepting the LXX, have judged them Appellatives, although they have translated them differently: *Aquila*, ἄρμασι λαῶ ἐκαστοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀρχοντος, *with the Chariots of the Prince of my willing People.* *Symmachus*, ἄρμασι λαῶ τῷ ἡγεμῶνι, *with the Chariots of the Leader of the People.* Likewise *Aben Ezra* acknowledges שתי מלות *Sbeti Meloth, two distinct appellative Words here;* and *Raschi* says, that *Ammi-Nadib* is the same with עם נדיב *Gnam Nadib, a willing People,* the י *Yod* being redundant in מי *Gnami, my People;* as it is in שכיני סנה *Schochni Snah, dwelling in the Bush,* Deut. xxxiii. 16. also in גנבתי יום *Ganubati Yom, stolen in the Day-time,* Genes. xxxi. 39. and in רבתי עם *Rabthi Gnam, full of People,* Lament. i. 1. To which the *Chaldee* Interpreter consents, having it thus: *I will take Counsel, or resolve in my Soul to do them Good.* ולשוואה יתרון גיתוני *And that I may place them high in the Chariots of Kings, &c.* And thus the greatest part of *Christian* Interpreters take it, excepting those who scrupulously adhere to the *Vulgate.* Only *Grotius* upon this Place affects to be singular, for he translates it, *because of the Chariots of Amminadab;* adding, *It appears to have been the Name of some well known Captain, who had a purple-colour'd Chariot.* But how *Grotius* came to know this Captain so well, whom no body else knows, I cannot understand. Certainly the Scripture acknowledgeth no such Captain of *Solomon* whose Name was *Amminadab*, neither does it speak of his purple-colour'd Chariot; and it only seems to be the Invention of *Grotius's* Brain. *Junius* and *Tremellius* express it better: *He put me upon the Chariots of*

my free People. † Henry Ainsworth also, if Mr. Whiston should chuse to hear the *English*, renders it rightly, translating it, *the Chariots of a noble and princely People*, rejecting the proper Name which the LXX here introduce. And that indeed is what the Sense chiefly requires. For it is evident from *Ezekiel*, that the Progress of the Gospel is designed by the *Chariots*; and the *willing People*, as we learn from *Psal. cx. 3.* signifies the Church to be made up of the Gentiles. Therefore after that *Christ* the Bridegroom had come into his Garden of Nuts, and seeking after Fruits worthy of Repentance, had found none, he would no more know it; but rejecting the Synagogue, he rejoiceth in the speedy and happy Progress of the Gospel among the Gentiles. Upon this Foundation, I thus interpret these Words: But *I have not known any more*, with a Knowledge of Affection, (as it is called) the unfruitful Vineyard, the rebellious and refractory *Jewish Synagogue*; therefore my Soul (my gracious Decree and good Pleasure concerning the Calling of the Gentiles) placed me, both my Name and my Mystery, upon the Chariots of my willing People, who being led by an ingenuous and free Spirit, *Psal. li. 12.* receive my Word, *μετὰ πάντων προθυμίας*, with all Readiness of Mind, *Acts xvii. 11.* Wherefore that thou mayest not be for ever excluded, *Return, O Church of Jerusalem, return, &c.* In this Way of Construction, this Text will declare the Rejection of the *Jews*, with a serious Invitation to Repentance, and the happy Calling of the Gentiles, attended with prosperous Success.

3. "When *Solomon* composed the *Canticles*, he loved many Women, as appears from *Cant. viii. 6.* where the King's principally beloved

† In Annot. ad h. l.

" Wife turning jealous, was greatly displeased,
 " because his Love was divided among so many
 " Wives and Concubines: nay farther in *Chap.*
 " vi. 8, 9. we have the express Number of sixty
 " Queens, and eighty Concubines set down,
 " whom he then kept when he writ the *Canti-*
 " *cles*. Here Mr. *Whiston* seriously beseeches
 " Commentators, in a long Harangue, diligent-
 " ly to consider, whether or no *Solomon* in the
 " loose part of his Life, while he writ the *Canticles*,
 " could then be assisted by the Spirit of God?
 " He farther alledges, that he was never esteem-
 " ed of the Number of the genuine Prophets,
 " who truly deserved that Name, although he
 " writ the *Proverbs* and *Ecclesiastes*; who then
 " can think or believe that he prophesied about
 " the *Messiah* and the Church, at the time when
 " he was totally immersed in sensual Pleasures
 " and Idolatry?

ANSW. *First*, It is very unscholar-like in Mr.
Whiston, to attribute the Jealousy spoken of *Ch. viii.*
6. to the Bride; for it is plain from the Masculine
 Suffixes in *לְבָבָהּ* *Lebacho*, and *זָרוּעָהּ* *Zaroacho*, and
 from the whole Context of the Discourse, that these
 are rather the Words of the Bride, extolling the
 ardent Love and fervent Jealousy of her heavenly
 Bridegroom. Accordingly this *קִנְיָה* *Kenah*, *Jeal-*
ousy, or conjugal Love, which here the Bride ac-
 knowledgeth and praiseth in the Bridegroom, the
 same is elsewhere ascribed to the Lord of Hosts,
Isa. ix. 6, &c. Therefore the Bride here speaks
 of that holy jealous Love, which may be cal-
 led *שְׁלֵהבַת יָהּ* *Shalbavat Jah*, the Flame of the
 Lord; whence we see, that our Adversary's tri-
 fling Pretences from these Words vanish entire-
 ly. *Calovius* of our Communion explains these
 Words appositely and with Strength of Reason,
 whose Paraphrase, because it handsomly opens

the whole Sense of the Text, we shall think it worth the Trouble to set down. "Death, says he, as a powerful and invincible Tyrant, because of Sin, retains a prevalent Power over all Mankind, neither is there any thing strong enough to break its Force. Hell shuts up the Prisoners as in the closest Dungeon, neither is there any one that can rescue or loose us from its Iron Chains. But thy Love, O most dearly beloved Bridegroom, thou Hero of two Natures, is no less strong than Death, in as much as thou hast vanquished the Power of Death it self; thy Jealousy is not less hard than Hell, in as much as thou hast even broken through the hardest Prison of Hell. Since then thou invitest and embracest me with thy Love, I am sure (*meaning the Bride*) that neither Death, nor Hell, is able to separate me from thy Love, even as Death and Hell suffer no body to be deliver'd from them.

Secondly, As to Chap. vi. 8. it is plain, that so many Queens and Concubines are not positively attributed to the King, but admitted by way of Supposition or Concession, and a certain and definite Number is put for indefinite, in this Sense: Although there were sixty Queens and eighty Concubines, and Virgins innumerable, yet my Dove is but one, &c. whom I infinitely prefer in my Affection before all the rest. So Junius and Tremellius; *Although there may be sixty Queens and eighty Concubines, and Virgins innumerable, yet that only beloved Dove of mine they shall call blessed:* which in their Notes they explain: "Although there should be many Queens and Concubines, and an innumerable Train of Attendance, they should not only not be equal unto thee, but

* In Bibl. Illustrat. ad h. l.

" they

“ they should freely and of their own Accord
 “ yield thee the Preference.” But here, under
 the Name of Queens and secondary Wives, are to
 be understood particular Churches, gathered toge-
 ther and brought out of this World in great
 Numbers unto *Christ*, 2 *Cor.* xi. 2. some of which
 are of larger Extent and more famous than o-
 thers: Moreover by the Name of Virgins are
 meant faithful People, dispersed up and down
 the World, living in Countries deprived of the
 pure Preaching of God’s Word and the publick
 Ministry; and that such are called Virgins, is
 clear from the *Revelations*. So then the Sense is
 this: “ Although many particular Churches in
 “ the whole World may be brought to *Christ* the
 “ Bridegroom, some of a larger Extent and
 “ Fame, others of a smaller; yet of all these, the
 “ one Catholick and Invisible Church of the E-
 “ lect gathered together, is chiefly loved by
 “ *Christ*, and is beautiful in his Eyes, having
 “ neither Spot nor Wrinkle, *Ephes.* v. 26. which
 “ also those particular Societies extol with Praises,
 “ and to her they all desire to be joined.” Thus
 our Adversary’s trifling Pretences come to no-
 thing.

Thirdly, Furthermore we have upon another
 Occasion made it appear, that a very great Inju-
 ry is done to *Solomon*, if he be excluded out of the
 Number and Catalogue of the Prophets: Only
 let it be observed, that he did not professedly
 discharge the prophetical Office in the Church,
 but that he followed a quite different Course of
 Life; nevertheless he was endowed with the
 Spirit and Gift of Prophecy, and his Books are
 nothing inferior to the other prophetical Writ-
 ings, in Dignity or Original. For that he pro-
 phesied of *Christ*, and that he was honour’d with
 divers prophetical Revelations; and finally, that

his Writings are referr'd to προφητικὸν λόγον, *that Word of Prophecy*, 2 Pet. i. 19. and unto θεμέλιον τῶν προφητῶν, *the Foundation of the Prophets*, Ephes. ii. 20. and that by this Means he himself was ἐν ἁγίοις Θεῶ ἀνθρώποις, *among the holy Men of God*, who writ and left προφητείας, ἡ δὲ δαίμων ἀνθρώπων, οὐκ ὑπὸ πνύματι ἁγίῳ φερόμενη, *his Prophecy which came not by the Will of Man, but as he was moved by the Holy Ghost*, 2 Pet. i. 21. All this is too evident, to be invalidated by any Sophistry of Mr. Whiston's.

Fourthly, Whatsoever finally our Antagonist pretends as to the *Canticles*, having been written amidst sensual Pleasures, flows from the false Hypothesis which he was possessed with, which it concerns him to prove by sufficient Evidences, before he persuades others to believe it. That Saying of St. Paul is very applicable to Mr. Whiston, τοῖς μεμιασμένοις ἔ ἀπίστοις ἔδεν καθαρὸν, *To them that are defiled and unbelieving, nothing is pure*, Tit. i. 15. And he is much in the same Case with those that look through a colour'd Glass, for every Thing appears to them to be of the same Colour with that which the Glass is of. When he looks upon and reads this Book with a profane and carnal Mind, he sees nothing holy or religious in it, but all Things appear defiled, and such as must be offensive to modest Ears and Eyes. Let him divest himself of his prejudicate Opinion under which he labours, and laying aside his Errors, let him call upon the Father of Lights to enlighten the Eyes of his Understanding, that he may be able to judge spiritually, and then will he entertain better Thoughts of that most chaste and most sublime Poem.

ii. "Moreover our Antagonist denies the Book
 " to be mystical and allegorical, as containing
 " nothing proper for inculcating Virtue, or in-
 " fusing

“ fusing the faving Knowledge of God into our
 “ Minds, for inflilling of pure Religion, and fi-
 “ nally for bringing us to underftand the myfte-
 “ rious Kingdom of the *Meffiah*. Next he fays,
 “ that he is afhamed to give a particular Detail of
 “ the immodeft and fcandalous Exprefſions fre-
 “ quently occurring in this Book, for which the
 “ Learned may confult the Annotations of *Hug.*
 “ *Grotius*. Wherefore he wifhes, that this ſmall
 “ Piece or Poem were left out of all our Bibles,
 “ that it might do no more harm either to *Jews*
 “ or *Chriftians*, and might give no more Handles
 “ to Scepticks and Unbelievers againſt the other
 “ Books of Scripture : And then he cites the Poet,

*Pudet hæc opprobria nobis
 Et dici potuiſſe, & non potuiſſe refelli.*

ANSW. *Fiſt*, Whatever he may advance to the contrary, yet this is *γενεφὴ ὠφέλιμος πρὸς διδασκαλίαν, πρὸς ἐλεγχον, πρὸς ἐπανόρθωσιν, πρὸς παιδείαν, τὴν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, A Scripture profitable for Doctrine, for Reproof, for Correction, for Inſtruction in Righteouſneſs, 2 Tim. iii. 16.* For from hence we have our Principles of Belief, concerning the *Meffiah* manifeſted in the Fleſh, and his Affection and Love towards the Church, concerning the myſtical Union of *Chriſt* and the Faithful, concerning the State of the Church in Proſperity and Adverſity, and of its various Viciffitudes, ſometimes under the Croſs, and at other Times in a comfortable and joyful Condition ; hence we take Comfort, from Conſideration of the moſt intense Love of *Chriſt* to the Church, and his Benefits liberally beſtowed upon her ; hence we are inſtructed concerning the Duties of every faithful Soul, by which to teſtify its Faith, Charity, Hope and Reverence towards *Chriſt*, her Lord and Bridegroom : all

these Things you may see fully insisted on by Interpreters.

Secondly, In this Way of Accusation, Mr. *Whiston* treads in the Footsteps of ancient Hereticks, mention'd by *Theodoret*, and *Philastrius*, and especially *Theodorus Mopsuestenus*, as also of some Writers of a later Date, *Seb. Castalio*, *Hug. Grotius*, and last of all, of those who wrote their Censures upon *Rich. Simonius*, whom *Clericus*, without right or reason, calls the *Belgick Divines*, * who scoffingly ridicule them who think that this mystical Book sings the Loves of *Christ* and his Church: They rather think it an *Idyllium* or *Eclogue*, where *Solomon* introduces himself in a pastoral Habit, talking with some one of his Wives, it may be the Daughter of *Pharaoh*. But there is no Difficulty here, if we turn over this Book with a chaste Mind, and a holy Hand. In old Times the Ark was to be covered, that it might not be look'd upon by impure and lascivious Eyes, *Numb. iv. 5. 1 Sam. vi. 19.* why should not also carnal Eyes, and the Curiosity of depraved Minds, which is at Enmity with God and his Mysteries, *Rom. viii. 7.* be kept back, from wantonly and profanely prying into such deep Mysteries of Faith and divine Love, and from touching the Sanctuary with their impure Hands. Let us first besprinkle our Minds with the Blood of *Christ*, before we enter into the Sanctuary, *Heb. x. 22.* And let us purify our Lips and Hearts with the Live-coal of the Spirit, *Isa. vi. 6.* before we speak of the ineffable Pleasures of this divine Love; and then we shall meet with nothing which can prove offensive to us. But let the profane Vulgar, and every unclean Mind, be kept back by

* Epist. 12. pag. 273, &c.

this solemn and ancient Saying: *ἐκὰς, ἐκὰς ἔσε βέλ-
ηλοι, procul, o procul este profani.*

Thirdly and Lastly, Let no body wonder, if as under the Type of Whoredom and Adultery, without giving Offence to any Man, the *holy Spirit* paints out and describes Idolatry, *Hof. i. 2. Jer. ii.* especially in *Ezek. xvi.* and other Places; so likewise he may here see that under the Type of a chaste Marriage, is represented to us the Love, Conversation, and Meditations of the Saints with *Christ*. For *St. Paul* certifies us, that *τίμιος ὁ γάμος ἐν παῶσι, καὶ ἡ κοίτη ἀμίαντος, Marriage is honourable in all, and the Bed undefiled, Heb. xiii. 4.* And who dare be so bold as to deny Phrases and Allegories taken from it, to be honourable and holy? Upon this Account the Scripture does not abstain from such Phrases, but rather for most wise Reasons and Purposes, upon Occasion makes its use of them, as we see from *Hof. ii. Psal. xlv. Rev. xxi. and xxii. 1 Cor. xi. &c.* Therefore, why do those things, which in other scriptural Records are read without Offence, give any Scandal in this Place? Or how come they to make it profane? Verily because, *οἱ ἀμαθεῖς καὶ ἀστήκελοι σρεβλῶσι ταῦτίῳ καὶ γερῶν, πρὸς τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτῶν ἀπώλειαν, the unlearned and unstable wrest that Scripture, to their own Destruction,* according to the Judgment of *St. Peter, 2 Epist. iii. 16.*

iii. “ Our Adversary gives out, that the Introduction of mystical Senses, is of a much later Date than the Days of *Solomon*; whence it is, that we find no entire Book, yea not so much as one Chapter, either in the Old or New Testament, or even in the *Apocrypha*, which is entirely allegorical; nor so much as a whole Chapter, and that Chapter left destitute of any certain Explication or Key to the Allegory: That symbolical and prophetick Language,
“ scriptural

“ scriptural Proverbs and Parables, are abund-
 “ dantly plain and clear; moreover, that sym-
 “ bolical or prophetick *Actions* have commonly
 “ their Interpretation annex’d to them, and this
 “ our Author endeavours to demonstrate by di-
 “ verse Examples. He alledges, that the *The-*
 “ *rapeutæ* were the first among the *Jews* who u-
 “ sed Allegories: Of them *Philo* speaks, and he
 “ also imitates them, and may be reckon’d the
 “ first Allegorical *Jewish* Author, whose Wri-
 “ tings have come to us; and that the first *Chri-*
 “ *stian* Author who used that way, is the Author
 “ of the *Gospel according to the Egyptians*. And
 “ that no Man may esteem the xlv *Psalms* to be
 “ one of this Kind of Writings, he says, that
 “ there is a great Difference betwixt it and the
 “ *Canticles*: that That *Psalms* contains nothing
 “ which offends modesty, that it makes no
 “ mention of sixty Queens, and eighty Concu-
 “ bines, but only one Bridegroom and one Bride;
 “ yea, that evident Footsteps of Piety and Vir-
 “ tue may be seen in it; as for Example, in
 “ *ψ* 2, 4, 6, 7. so that it cannot be compar’d
 “ with the *Canticles*, yea rather, that by com-
 “ paring them together it appears, that the *Can-*
 “ *ticles* were written about the End of *Solomon’s*
 “ Reign, when he was altogether given up to
 “ his sensual Pleasures.

ANSW. At the reading of these Things, one
 may justly doubt, whether he should mostly stand
 amazed at Mr. *Whiston’s* Front and Assurance, or
 be offended at the extravagant Freedom he uses
 in romancing, which here he so plainly manifests.
 That the Custom of using mystical Senses or Alle-
 gories, was much later than *Solomon*, and that the
 first Original of them is to be referr’d to the Age
 of the *Essenes*, or *Therapeutæ*, is clearly confuted
 upon the first Sight of the Old Testament, For
 what

what shall we make of *Jotham's* Apologue, *Judg.* ix. 8. &c. what can be said of *Nathan's* Parable, 2 *Sam.* xii. 1, &c. what of the Allegories, symbolical Visions, and figurative Speeches of the Prophets, to be found every where in their Writings, but chiefly obvious in *Jeremiah*, *Ezekiel*, *Daniel*, and *Zechariah*? And was not the whole Theology of ancient *Israel* mystical and symbolical, explain'd to the ignorant People by the Priests and *Levites*? Were not all those Things which happened to the *Israelites* wandering through the Deserts, before they entred into the Land of Promise, our Examples, as the Apostle expresseth it, *τύποι ἐκτυπηθέντες*, they were Types or Examples, 1 *Cor.* x. 6. Had not those Things which *Christ* so fully explains, about the brasen Serpent, *John* iii. 14, 15. and the *Manna*, *John* vi. 32, &c. a mystical Sense, upon the outward Appearance whereof the ancient Church did not depend, but had a further View to the internal and spiritual Meaning? Compare the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, with their entring into the Land of *Canaan*, with their Rites used in their Sacrifices, their Day of Expiation, and their High-Priest, as also with the Account of *Melchizedek*, and there you will find a full Explanation of all these Things. And that *Solomon* himself delighted in this refined Way of speaking his three thousand Proverbs or Parables, 1 *King.* iv. 32. as also, the Dialogues and Conversation which he entertain'd with the Queen of *Sbeba* (or *Arabia*) ch. x. 1. abundantly shew. Doth not our Adversary acknowledge a mystical Sense in the viii and ix Chapters of the *Proverbs*, where we have no Key given to open the Meaning? Not to speak of the vii and xxxi. Chapters of the *Proverbs*, which famous Commentators do not impertinently explain in a mystical Sense? Yea further, is *Mr. Wbiston* ignorant, that in the

New Testament, this was the solemn and almost perpetually receiv'd Manner of Teaching, used by our Saviour, who, *παιύτως ᾠδῶν καὶ ψαλμοῖς πολλοῖς ἐλάλει τὸν λόγον*, in many such Parables spoke the Word, Mark iv. 33. Yea, *χωρὶς παραβολῆς ἐκ ἐλάλει πρὸς ὄχλους*, without a Parable, he did not speak to the Multitude, Matth. xiii. 34. for which Manner of speaking he gives good Reasons, *ψ* 11, &c. Will he disallow an allegorical Meaning in St. Paul, Galat. iv. 22, &c? or in St. Peter iii. 20, &c? or in St. John in the Revelations? As little Credit is to be given to what he babbles about an Explication being added to every mystical and allegorical Place; the Falsity of which immediately appears from so many propheticall Allegories, which have no Key to them, and which for that very Reason are to this Day so very difficult to be explain'd. Our Assertion is proved either by the Visions of the single Prophet Daniel, or the Revelations of St. John.

What our *Antagonist* further advanceth about the *Therapeutæ* (from a Book of Philo, which he writ concerning the Institution and particular Manner of Life, which the *Essenes* followed) and what long before him Lud. Cappellus observed in his *Treatise*, which he compos'd from the Book of Zobar, upon the mystical and allegorical Sense of Gen. ii. 4, 5, 6. afterwards subjoin'd to his Account of the true and ancient Hebrew Letters, p. 215. and afterwards inserted by Jac. Cappellus the Son, at p. 305, &c. of the *Commentaries* and *critical Notes* of his Father upon the Old Testament; these Things prove, that those Men took Pleasure in mystical and allegorical Interpretations of the sacred Books, but they do not prove that they were the first Inventors of them.

Finally, How great the Harmony and Consonancy

nancy of the *xlv Psalm* with the *Canticles* is, in the Subject, Invention, Plan, Scope, Phrase and Expression, all Interpreters shew, but especially our ^u *Gerhard*, with great Pains and Solidity, where he also mentions *Theodore* of the same Opinion. But the Reason why our Adversary is so averse to comparing these two Poems is, because after such Comparison rightly made, he could not but confess the *Canticles* to be divinely inspir'd, and give up the Cause. Neither is there any Reason for his frequent Complaints, that in it there are Forms of Speech inconsistent with Decency and Modesty, since he doth not deny the *xvi Chapter* of *Ezekiel*, to proceed from the Spirit of God, tho' it contains some harsh Phrases, which would readily prove offensive to the carnal Reader, and which those Things which in the *Canticles* are turn'd to a bad Sense by bold malapert Wits, scarcely come up to.

iv. " None of the Writers of the Old Testament ever cited the Song of *Solomon*, neither
 " did they make any Allusion to it; and altho'
 " the *Jews* after the Destruction of their City
 " and Commonwealth, say that *Ezra* with the
 " Men of the great Synagogue, in the collecting
 " and settling of the *Hebrew Canon*, reckon'd up
 " and inserted the *Canticles* with other holy
 " Books; yet Mr. *Whiston* pleads, that all this
 " historical Account contains nothing but a *Jewish*
 " Fable and Figment.

ANSW. I know of no Law or Order, that a Book shall not be canonical, if it be not quoted by other Authors of the Old Testament; for by this Rule, other Books also, both of *Solomon* and of some of the Prophets would be excluded this Honour; besides it is utterly false, that the *Canticles* have no concurring Approbation. For it is

^u Prolegom. ad Postill. Solomon. Cantici, cap. 5. toto.

scarce to be doubted by any, but the Holy Ghost had respect to this Book in *Hos.* ii. 19, 20. Moreover, that the *Canticles* had a Place in their Books of Festivals, and consequently in the Order of *כתובים Catubem*, even in the Time of *Christ* and the Apostles, is too evident to be turn'd off by a bare Denial; since that Distinction of the Books of the Bible into three Classes is very ancient.

Finally, When our Adversary takes upon him to attack the *great Synagogue*, and to reckon it a Fable, it is necessary for him to advance firm and invincible Arguments to overturn the whole Credit of that History. The *Jews* almost universally agree in it, whose Suffrages * *Buxtorf* has given us in good Plenty, and most of the Christians, and those who are well skill'd in *Jewish* Antiquities, yea almost all who have spoken upon this Subject, before *Jac. Alting*. Neither is there any Reason for Doubt, unless it be, that *Josephus* is silent upon this Head, which is not enough to oblige us to reject the universal Consent of Antiquity. So then it continues in Possession of the Character of Truth and assured Fidelity, unless it be turn'd out of it by very weighty and solid Reasons.

v. " The Apocryphal Writers of the Old Testament, never approv'd of the *Canticles*, by any Citation or Allusion.

ANSW. Therefore in Mr. *Whiston's* Opinion, God in his Word stands in need *ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπου καὶ μαρτυρίαν λαμβάνειν*, to receive Testimony from Man, contrary to the Judgment of our Blessed Saviour, *John* v. 34. neither shall any Books of canonical Credit and Authority abide, unless it be made good from an *Apocryphal* one. But let our Ad-

* Comment. Masorethici cap. 10, nec non ad librum *Cofri*, p. 3. cap. 65. p. 139.

versary call to mind the seventeenth of the xlvii Chapter of the *Son of Syrach*, where he praises the *Songs* and *Proverbs* of *Solomon*, and then he will forbear to deny, that the Apocryphal Books do at all approve of the *Canticles*.

vi. “*Philo*, who was prodigiously fond of mystical or allegorical Sense of Scripture, yet never cited nor alluded to the *Canticles*; which may be an Argument, that in his Time the *Hellenist Jews* had no such Book in their *Greek Bibles*.

ANSW. We are not inquiring into the Time when the *Hellenist* or *Alexandrian Jews* translated this Book into *Greek*, but into its divine Original and Canonical Authority. Whether then in the Age of *Philo*, the *Canticles* were read in *Greek* or not, is all one upon the Matter, if it had Place in the *Hebrew Canon*, from the Time of *Solomon*; and this our Antagonist cannot deny. Not to mention that the Silence of *Philo* is but a weak Argument to build upon, for denying the *Greek Translation* of this Book.

vii. “*Josephus* not only no where cites nor alludes to the *Song of Songs*, but also in his Catalogue of the divinely inspired Scriptural Books, he takes no Notice of it. Upon this Argument Mr. *Whiston* lays the main Stress of his Opinion for excluding the *Canticles* out of the Canon, and he transcribes the entire Place of *Josephus*; and then Mr. *Whiston* so orders the Names of the particular Books, which *Josephus* had not set down, as to leave no Place to the *Canticles* in the Catalogue of the two and twenty Books. *Josephus* reckons up five Books of *Moses*, thirteen Prophetical Books, and four others, which $\mu\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\varsigma\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\acute{\omicron}\ \Theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\nu,\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\acute{\nu}\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\iota\varsigma$

γ Ex Lib. I. contra Apion. S. 8.

“ *ᾠδαὶ τῷ βίῳ ἀείχουσι*, contain Hymns in the
 “ Praise of God, and Precepts to direct the Life
 “ of Man. Our Adversary so numbers them up,
 “ as to make the Prophetical Books these follow-
 “ ing: First, *Joshua*; secondly, *Judges*, with the
 “ little Book of *Ruth*; thirdly, *Samuel*; fourth-
 “ ly, *the Kings*; fifthly, *Chronicles*; sixthly, *Ez-*
 “ *ra*; seventhly, *Nebemiah*; eighthly, *Esther*;
 “ ninthly, *Isaiab*; tenthly, *Jeremiab* with the *La-*
 “ *mentations*; eleventhly, *Ezekiel*; twelfthly,
 “ *Daniel*; and thirteenthly, *Δωδεκαπρόφητον*, the
 “ twelve lesser Prophets: And then he reckons the
 “ four following Moral Books; first, *Job*; se-
 “ condly, *the Psalms*; thirdly, *the Proverbs*;
 “ fourthly, *Ecclesiastes*, as follows:

- | | | | |
|----|---|---|----------------------------------|
| 1 | <i>Genesis.</i> | } | The five Books of <i>Moses</i> . |
| 2 | <i>Exodus.</i> | | |
| 3 | <i>Leviticus.</i> | | |
| 4 | <i>Numbers.</i> | | |
| 5 | <i>Deuteronomy.</i> | | |
| 1 | <i>Joshua.</i> | } | The thirteen Prophets. |
| 2 | <i>Judges, with Ruth.</i> | | |
| 3 | <i>Samuel.</i> | | |
| 4 | <i>Kings.</i> | | |
| 5 | <i>Chronicles.</i> | | |
| 6 | <i>Ezra.</i> | | |
| 7 | <i>Nebemiah.</i> | | |
| 8 | <i>Esther.</i> | | |
| 9 | <i>Isaiab.</i> | | |
| 10 | <i>Jeremiab, with the</i>
<i>Lamentations.</i> | | |
| 11 | <i>Ezekiel.</i> | | |
| 12 | <i>Daniel.</i> | | |
| 13 | <i>XII Minor Prophets</i>
in one Book. | | |

- 1 *Job.*
- 2 *Psalms.*
- 3 *Proverbs.*
- 4 *Ecclesiastes.*

} The 4 Books of Hymns
and Instructions for the
Conduct of Human Life

ANSW. So stands Mr. *Whiston's* Canon; but not so *Josephus's*, nor yet the ancient Canon of the *Jews*. For he is here guilty of a manifest Fraud in reckoning up the Books of *Nehemiah* and *Ezra* separately, which two all *Jewish* Antiquity joins together, and calls them the first and second of *Ezra*. For Proof of this I quote *Epiphanius*, who accurately reciting the *Jewish* Canon, according to the twenty two Letters, omits *Nehemiah*, as comprehended under the Book of *Ezra*. Thus also *Isidorus*: "This Book bears the Name of its Author; in whose Text are contained the Words both of *Ezra* and *Nehemiah*." So likewise *Jerom* reckons the *Canticles* apart, comprehending *Nehemiah* under *Ezra*, and tells us, that there are twenty two in all. After the same Manner the *Talmudists*: And, excepting Mr. *Whiston*, almost all who with *Josephus* reckon up twenty two Books. By this Means *Job*, according to the Intent of *Josephus*, will belong to the Prophetical, and will leave a Place for the *Canticles* among the four Poetical and Moral Books, as thus:

- 1 *Genesis.*
- 2 *Exodus.*
- 3 *Leviticus.*
- 4 *Numbers.*
- 5 *Deuteronomy.*

} The five Books of *Moses*.

^a Libro de Mensuris & Ponderibus, c. 4.
riginum, c. 2. *Esdrae*. ^b Prologo in Reg.

^a Lib. 6. O.
^c In Baba

Bathra.

- | | | | |
|----|---|---|------------------------|
| 1 | <i>Joshua.</i> | } | The thirteen Prophets. |
| 2 | <i>Judges, with Ruth.</i> | | |
| 3 | <i>Samuel.</i> | | |
| 4 | <i>Kings.</i> | | |
| 5 | <i>Chronicles.</i> | | |
| 6 | <i>Ezra and Nehemiah</i> | | |
| 7 | <i>Esther.</i> | | |
| 8 | <i>Isaiab.</i> | | |
| 9 | <i>Jeremiab, with the Lamentations.</i> | | |
| 10 | <i>Ezekiel.</i> | | |
| 11 | <i>Daniel.</i> | | |
| 12 | <i>Minor Prophets XII. in one Book.</i> | | |
| 13 | <i>Job.</i> | | |
| 1 | <i>Psalms.</i> | | |
| 2 | <i>Proverbs.</i> | | |
| 3 | <i>Ecclesiastes.</i> | } | |
| 4 | <i>The Song of Solomon.</i> | | |

viii. “*Christ himself, who is supposed to be the Bridegroom in the Canticles, and who used the like Parables concerning Marriages, Matth. xxii. is yet never observed to have cited or made any Allusion to the Song of Solomon.*”

ANSW. As scarce the hundredth Part of *Christ's* Discourses is committed to Writing by the Evangelists, and transmitted to us, so that after spending whole Days in Teaching, we may as justly affirm of what he spoke, as *St. John* asserted of what he did, *Chap. xxi. 25.* ἄτινα ἐὰν γεράφηται καθ' ἓν, ἔδὲ αὐτὸν οἶμαι ὅτι κόσμον χωρεῖσαι τὰ γερόμνητα βιβλία· which if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the World itself could not contain the Books that should be written: So from the Silence of the Evangelists, no just Conclusion can be drawn as to *Christ's* not approving of this Book. Accordingly, though we read not in the Evangelists,

gelists, that *Christ* gave any Testimony to the Books of *Joel*, *Amos*, *Obadiab*, *Nabum*, *Habakkuk*, and other Prophets, yet he doth not therefore disallow of their Canonical Dignity; neither is it certain or evident, whether he did not refer to all of them in his unwritten Sermons, as Occasion offer'd: so that we have no Warrant for drawing any Argument against the divine Inspiration of a Book from that Topick. But who can deny that our Saviour alluded to the *Canticles*; *Matth.* ix. 15. xxii. 2. xxv. 15, &c. where, if the whole Verses or Sentences are not, yet the Things themselves, and the Thoughts, are well known to be taken from the *Canticles*?

ix. " St. *John* towards the End of the *Revelations*, ch. xix. 7, 9. xxi. 1, 2. speaks of the " Marriage of the Lamb, and also of the *Messiah* " and the new *Jerusalem*, adorned like unto a " Bride; and yet he neither quotes the *Canticles*, " nor doth he make any Allusion thereto; " whence it is evident, that this little Book is " neither mystical nor sacred.

ANSW. Our Adversary conscious of the Thing, endeavours to elude those Places of the *Revelations*, as finding them too plainly to respect the *Canticles*. For there is no doubt but wheresoever *Christ* is styled the Bridegroom, and his mystical Marriage with the Church, or with the faithful Soul, is spoken of, that there this Book is always pointed to, as being the principal and native Source of this Article. Therefore although St. *John* doth not expressly cite the *Canticles*, yet doth not *Christ* in *Revel.* iii. 20. plainly allude to *Cant.* v. 2? Hath not the Epilogue, which concludes the *Revelations*, ch. xxii. 20. and the whole sacred Book been borrowed from *Cant.* v. 1, 2? And those very Testimonies about the Marriage of the Lamb, which our Adversary pretends to

invalidate, are they not to be referred to the *Canticles*, as Streams to their Fountain Head? We see then, that the *Revelations* is so far from leaving the *Canticles* without a Witness, that it rather proves the same by plain Indications.

x. “ Four of the Apostles [St. *Peter*, St. *Paul*, “ St. *James*, St. *Jude*,] *Clemens Roman.* in his Epistles, *Barnabas* a famous allegorical Writer, “ *Hermas* and *Polycarp*, never cite the Song of “ *Solomon*, altho’ they have quoted many Books “ of the Old Testament.

ANSW. First, Truly Mr. *Whiston* very inconsiderately joins here together, not only those Ecclesiastical Writers, *Clemens Romanus*, *Barnabas* and *Polycarp*, (putting them upon an equal Foot with the divinely inspired Pen-men) but even the spurious *Hermas* also, whose *Pastor*, by Consent of the Generality of the Learned, is a meer Forgery. Are they then all of them of equal Authority? Are the Writings of these Authors ranked in the same Order and Class by Mr. *Whiston*? If so, he has a very mean Opinion of the Canon of the New Testament. Besides, there is no Necessity which obliges us to cut off from the Canon of the Old Testament, every Writing which is not cited, nor expressly allowed by the Authors of the New. For what shall become of the Book of *Esther*, and of the Prophecy of *Obadiah*, both which want the actual Approbation of the New Testament? For as a Book’s being barely cited in Scripture does not make that Book become divine which was before only a prophane and human Writing; so on the other Hand, neither is a Book to be excluded the Scripture Canon, when it proves its Canonicalness by all other Tokens, and only wants the being quoted in the New Testament.

Finally,

Finally, It is false that the Approbation of the New Testament is wanting to the *Canticles*, as may be understood from what has been said in the preceding eighth and ninth Sections, to which other Testimonies might be added. For *John the Baptist*, being to demonstrate incontrovertibly, *Jesus of Nazareth* to be the promised *Messiah*, *John* iii. 29. refers to the *Canticles*, and describes him by this Character; that he hath a Right to take the Bride to himself, [ch. iv. 8, &c. v. 1.] Again *St. Paul* informing us, that the Church is purged and washed in the Blood of *Christ* from all Uncleaness, *2 Cor.* xi. 2. *Ephes.* v. 27. did not think that he could prove it by a more divine Testimony, than one taken from *Cant.* iv. 7. But what need is there of any more Words in a plain Case.

xi. "Believers are exhorted in the first Book of
 "the *Apostolical Constitutions*^d, which is much an-
 "cienter than the Destruction of *Jerusalem*:
 "Ἀναλινώσκειν τὸ νόμον, τὰς βασιλείας, τὸν προφήτας,
 "καὶ ψάλλειν τὸν ὕμνον Δαβὶδ. To read the Law, the
 "Books of Kings, the Prophets, and to sing the
 "Psalms of David. And again^e, Εἴτε ἰσραελικά θεί-
 "λαις διέρχεσθαι, ἔχεις τὰς βασιλείας, εἴτε σοφιστικά καὶ
 "ποιητικά, ἔχεις τὸν προφήτας, τὸ Ἰωβ, τὸ παροιμιαν
 "ἐνὶ σὺν — εἴτε αἰσμαλικῶν ὁρέγη, ἔχεις τὸν ψαλμὸν·
 "εἴτε ἀρχαιοστονίας, ἔχεις τὸν γένεσιν· εἴτε νομίμων καὶ πα-
 "ραγγελιών, τὸ ἐνδοξον Κυρίου τῷ Θεῷ νόμον. If thou
 "hast a mind to read History, thou hast the Books
 "of the Kings: If Books of Wisdom or Poetry, thou
 "hast the Prophets, Job, and the Writer of the
 "Proverbs; or if thou desirest Songs, thou hast the
 "Psalms: if the Origin of Things, thou hast Gene-
 "sis; or if Laws and Statutes, thou hast the glori-
 "ous Law of the Lord God. Whence it appears,

^d Cap. 5.^e Cap. 6.

“ that the Song of *Solomon* is not reckoned up among the canonical Books of Scripture, neither is it thought worthy to be recommended to the frequent and careful reading of the Faithful.

ANSW. If there be any thing considerable in this, by the same Argument you will exclude the Books of *Joshua*, *Judges*, *Ruth*, *Ezra*, *Nehemiah*, and *Esther*, both from the Canon, and likewise from being read by the People. But verily as the *Constitutions* do not here intend to give an exact Catalogue of the Books, and (to speak with the School-men) do not design to enumerate every *Individual of the Kinds*, but every *Kind of the Individuals* of the sacred Books: So it is well for us, that the Authenticity of the Books of the Old Testament doth not stand or fall by the Testimony of the falsely named *Apostolical Constitutions*, but is determined by other Tokens and Evidences. As to the Age of the *Apostolical Constitutions* I shall say nothing, since in another Place I have demonstrated, that it falls much later than the Destruction of *Jerusalem*, or the first Century. His remaining Arguments are of much the same Weight and Significancy.

xii. “ He argues from the second Book of the *Apostolical Constitutions*, Ch. v. and vii. where “ when the publick Reading of the Scripture is “ appointed, the Books of the Law, of *Joshua*, “ of the *Judges*, of the *Kings*, and of the *Chronicles*, and those written after the Return from “ the *Babylonish* Captivity, yea finally the Books “ of *Job*, and of *Solomon*, and the sixteen Prophets, are indeed expressly spoken of, but “ the *Canticles* are not so much as once mentioned.” As if the indefinite and general mentioning of *Solomon’s* Books did not comprehend the *Canticles*, as well as the *Proverbs* and *Ecclesiastes*.

i xiii. “ He

xiii. "He argues farther from the fifth Book of
 " the *Constitutions*, which gives an Account of
 " many Prophecies about *Christ*, taken out of the
 " Old Testament, and towards the End refers
 " to the xlv *Psalms*, without giving us the least
 " Ground to believe, that the *Canticles* were at
 " that Time known among *Christians*. And,

xiv. "He pleads the whole eight Books of the
 " *Constitutions*, in which you will not find the
 " *Canticles* so much as once quoted, though
 " many both of the *Canonical* and *Apocryphal*
 " Books are there cited." And yet he is
 immediately after forced to confess, that in
 the xiii and xviii Chapters of the sixth Book of
 the *Constitutions*, a Text is expressly taken out
 of the 15th Verse of the ii Chapter of the *Canti-*
cles; but he would have us to believe, that
 St. *Clement*, the *Amanuensis* of the Apostles, took
 it rather from some proverbial Phrase, than from
 the Song of *Solomon*.

Moreover, He still trifles most egregiously,
 where he endeavours to elude and refute the
 Authorities of the 85th *Apostolical Canon*, of the
 Epistle of *Ignatius* to the *Ephesians*, S. 6. and of
 the Catalogue of the Books of the Bible, which
 in the second Century *Melito Sardenfis* brought
 from the *East*, and which *Eusebius*^f has preserv'd
 and transmitted down to Posterity; though, in
 the mean while, neither the Canons, nor the
 Books of *Constitutions*, commonly call'd *Aposto-*
lical, are able to make good, either their Ori-
 ginal, or their Age, or their Authority, and
 therefore they are neither proper nor credible
 Witnesses of the Canon receiv'd by the Apostles.
 So then for certifying the divine Authority of
 any Book, it is no Matter whether it be named

^f Lib. 4. Hist. Eccles. cap. 26.

in the pretended *Apostolical Canons*, and *Constitutions*, or not, especially since the latter do not give any exact and particular List of the Books of the Old Testament. Neither doth Mr. *Whiston* gain any more Advantage, when towards the Conclusion, he studiously inculcates, that they who reject the Authority and Genuineness of the *Constitutions*, and the larger Epistles of St. *Ignatius*, have no ancienter Testimony to produce for the *Canticles*, than that of *Melito*: And that falls in with the *fatal Period*, or Interval, between the Destruction of *Jerusalem*, A. D. 70. and the Days of *Theodotion* and *Aquila*, about A. D. 128. when allegorical Senses were in Fashion, and the *Rabbins* greatly corrupted those sacred Books. For it is sufficient for us, that the *Christian Church* received the *Song of Solomon*, together with the Rest of the Canon of the Old Testament, at the same Time, and by the same Authority; and that it cannot be prov'd that it was wanting in the *Hebrew Copy* in the first Century, or that about the Beginning of the second Century, it was first palm'd by the *Jews* upon the *Christians*, who before that Time, had been totally ignorant of it. For who can reasonably imagine, that either the Apostles, when they were planting Churches throughout all the World, did not take sufficient Care as to providing them a sufficient Canon of Scripture, when at the same Time they so earnestly press'd upon and recommended the keeping of it to the Doctors of the Church, 1 *Tim.* iv. 6, 12, 13. 2 *Tim.* i. 13. ii. 15. iii. 14, &c. 1 *Tit.* i. 9, &c. Or that so many Thousands of the *Jews*, who immediately in the first Century, and while the Apostles were yet alive, came into *Christ*, Acts ii. 41—47. xxi. 20. and who held the Books of the Old Testament in the greatest Veneration, did

did not bring with them into the Church the *Hebrew Copies* entire and uncorrupt, but should leave Room for the *Rabbins* (the most bitter and cruel Enemies of the Name of *Christ*) either to mutilate the *Hebrew Canon* on one Hand, or to enlarge it with spurious Additions on the other? But suppose no Voucher could be brought for this Book within the first Century, from which but a very few ecclesiastical Writings, as Planks preserved in a Shipwreck, have come down to us, and those not sufficiently cleared beyond all Scruple; yet we have one very sufficient Witness, and above all Exception, the *Holy Ghost* himself, who breathing in the *Canticles*, and influencing its pious Readers, *Testifies, that the Spirit is Truth*, and hath approv'd of and recommended it to the Church by so many Suffrages of the New Testament. Whose Testimony if Mr. *Whiston* either eludes or disesteems, he may apply to himself, as if it were directed to him, that awful Saying, *I Job. v. 10. ὁ μὴ πιστεύων τῷ Θεῷ, ᾤσινω πεποίηκεν αὐτόν. He that believeth not God hath made him a Liar.*

C H A P. V.

Of the genuine and primitive Character of the Hebrew Letters.

OUR Antagonist has carefully raked together all the Reproaches and Slanders, which at any Time have been advanced against the *Hebrew Text* by its common Enemies: And because some have believed, that they might succeed the better in their Charge of Corruption
upon

upon the *Hebrew* Text, if they could but shew that the sacred Records of the Old Testament, were at first written in a quite different Character from that which the *Jews* at present use: Mr. *Whiston* lays hold of that also, warping it to his Purpose in such a Manner, as to accommodate the Accusation as near as possible to his main *Hypothesis*. § We have discuss'd this whole Matter in another Place, and have both considered the Opinion of the adverse Party, and baffled their Attempts: Yet as our Adversary endeavours to give a new Colour to the Charge, on Account of the Time in which he places that so bold an Undertaking, let us hear what he has to say in due Order, that he may have no Reason to complain of his being repulsed and condemned without a Hearing.

Thus then stands his PROPOSITION
V. Page 149.

That entire Change which has been made in the Characters of the Hebrew Bible, from the old Samaritan, to the new Chaldee, was not done by Ezra, as the modern Jews pretend; but by the Jews themselves about the beginning of the second Century of Christianity.

HE accordingly supposes, with the other Asserters of a new Character, that the original and primitive Letters of the Scripture were the *Samaritan*, and that they were the very Letters, in which the divinely inspired Authors

§ Crit. Sacr. P. 1. cap. 5. Sect. 6. S. 10.

writ those Books, which notwithstanding were afterwards chang'd for that Square and later Character, which at present takes Place in the *Hebrew* Bible, and is the proper and original Character of the *Chaldees*. But herein he differs from the common Crowd, in referring this Change, not to *Ezra*, and the Times nearest to the Return from the *Babylonish* Captivity, but to the End of the first, or the Beginning of the second Century, namely, to that Age wherein the *Jews* industriously corrupted the Scriptures. He further says, that the Contrivers of this Innovation, to avoid the Odium of it, carefully persuaded their Disciples and Posterity, that *Ezra*, with his Collegues, had long before made this Alteration. This he endeavours thus to prove,

“ *First*, Because it is not likely, that *Ezra*, a
 “ Man of unquestionable Probity, would have
 “ attempted such a dangerous Innovation, to
 “ take away from his Nation all their ancient,
 “ genuine, and uncorrupt Copies of the sacred
 “ Books used by their Forefathers, and in their
 “ room to give them new, and strange, and
 “ suspected Copies, although in their own Lan-
 “ guage indeed, but in a foreign Letter, and
 “ all this without any Necessity for so doing,
 “ or any considerable Benefit accruing thereby
 “ to them.

“ *Secondly*, The *Jews* who returned from the
 “ *Babylonian* Captivity, had not forgotten the
 “ ancient *Hebrew* Language, which was their
 “ Mother Tongue. For after they were deliver-
 “ ed from Captivity, the Books of *Daniel*, *Ezra*,
 “ *Nehemiah*, *Haggai*, *Zechariah*, and *Malachi*, were
 “ wholly written in *Hebrew*, not in the *Chaldee*:
 “ And *Nehem.* viii. 3, 9. the promiscuous Mul-
 “ titude did not only hear the *Hebrew* reading
 “ of the Law of *Moses* with Attention, but they
 also

“ also understood it exactly: As also ^h *Josephus*
 “ tells us, that the *Jews*, who after the Death
 “ of *Ezra*, came to *Susa*, a City of *Persia*, con-
 “ vers’d *Ἑβραϊστ*, in the *Hebrew Language*: And
 “ finally, the ⁱ *Son of Syrach* assures us, that his
 “ Grandfather’s Commentaries were originally
 “ written *Ἑβραϊστ*, in *Hebrew*.

“ *Thirdly*, There is no ancient or authentick
 “ Testimony, which can make out, that *Ezra*
 “ was guilty of such Imposition. The Books
 “ of *Ezra* and *Nehemiah*, whereto such a Histo-
 “ ry would most naturally belong, have not a
 “ Syllable to that Purpose, but rather the con-
 “ trary. We read nothing of it in the Apocry-
 “ phal Books. *Aristeas*, *Aristobulus*, *Philo*, and
 “ *Josephus*, on all Occasions are wholly silent a-
 “ bout it. So that from the Days of *Ezra* him-
 “ self, to the End of the first Century, no Au-
 “ thority can be brought for confirming that
 “ Tradition.

“ *Fourthly*, *Aristeas*, who compos’d the Hi-
 “ story of the Translation of the LXX Elders,
 “ about two hundred Years before *Christ*, yet
 “ says, the sacred Books were *Ἑβραϊκὰ γράμματα*,
 “ *Hebrew Characters*, proper and peculiar to that
 “ Nation and Religion. Yea, he affirms direct-
 “ ly, that both the Letters and Language were *He-*
 “ *brew*, *τυχεῖναι Ἑβραϊκοῖς γράμμασι καὶ φωνῇ λεγό-*
 “ *μενα*.

“ *Fifthly*, ^k *Josephus* never gives the least
 “ Hint that the old Characters of the sacred
 “ Books had been any way changed, but he ever
 “ styles them, not the *Chaldee*, but the ⁱ *Hebrew*
 “ *Character*.

“ *Sixthly*, The *Jews*, as well in the Age of

^h Antiquit. Lib. XI. Cap. 5.

^k In Archæologia

ⁱ In Præf. Eccles.

^j Vid. Antiq. præfem.

“ *Origen*

“ *Origen* and *Jerom*, as when both their *Talmuds*
 “ were written, do unanimously confess, that the
 “ *Samaritan Characters* were the Original ones.
 “ They pretend indeed, that they were changed
 “ for the *Chaldean* by *Ezra*, yet they do it in
 “ such a Manner, that they seem rather to mean
 “ the counterfeit *Esdra*s. And Mr. *Whiston*
 “ shrewdly suspects, that a great Part of those
 “ Things which they impute to *Ezra* and his
 “ great *Synagogue*, rather belong to *Rabbi Akiba*,
 “ and his later *small Sanhedrin* at *Tiberias*.

“ *Seventhly*, There were remains of the old
 “ *Samaritan Character*, even in the Days of *Ori-*
 “ *gen* and *Jerom*. For as *Origen*, testifies, the *πί-*
 “ *ταλον*, or golden Forehead Plate, worn by the
 “ *High-Priest*, with the sacred *τετραγράμματος* up-
 “ on it, had that Name, not in the *Chaldee*, but
 “ *Samaritan Character*: And again, the same
 “ ^m *Origen* in *Montfaucon* testifies, that the most
 “ authentick *Hebrew Copies*, tho’ they were o-
 “ therwise in the *Chaldee Letter*, had yet pre-
 “ served the *Tetragrammaton Name*, or *יהוה* *Je-*
 “ *bovah*, written in the Ancient, or *Samaritan*
 “ Letters. And ⁿ *Jerom* affirms, even of his Time,
 “ that in some *Greek Copies*, this Name was still
 “ preserved in the same *Samaritan Letters*. See
 “ also ^o *Eusebius*.

“ *Eighthly*, What seems to put the Matter out
 “ of Doubt is this; that the *Samaritan Inscrip-*
 “ tions upon the old *Jewish Shekels* shew, that
 “ in the Ages jst before *Christ*, even to the De-
 “ struction of *Jerusalem*, that Nation still used
 “ the *Samaritan Characters*, without having then
 “ changed them for the *Chaldean*; whence Mr.

^m Hexaplor. T. I. in Anecd. Orig. p. 86.
 prologo galeato.
 Psal. lxxxix. 2.

ⁿ In Psal. lxvii. 18, 21, 23. and in
 Psal. lxxxix. 2.

“ *Whiston* concludes, that the change was not
 “ made by *Ezra*, but that it happen'd about
 “ the End of the first, or the Beginning of the
 “ second *Century*. Moreover, he suspects that
 “ the *Jews* had Thoughts at that Time of drop-
 “ ping the old *Hebrew Bible*, and setting up
 “ the *Chaldee Paraphrase*, or *Targumim*, in its
 “ stead.

“ Lastly, he propos'd these two *Queries* to
 “ learned Men. First, Whether or no those Parts
 “ of *Ezra* and *Daniel*, which we read in *Chal-*
 “ *dee*, may not possibly be the Remains of that
 “ dangerous Attempt for dropping the *Hebrew*
 “ *Bible* entirely? Secondly, Whether when this
 “ Design appear'd too barefac'd to take, the
 “ *Jews* did not endeavour to substitute the Use
 “ of the *Chaldee Paraphrases*, in Place of the
 “ *Hebrew Bible*? Let the Learned judge.

ANSW. In examining what Weight there may
 be in these Reasons, we shall not be very soli-
 citous about those Things which are against the
 Change, suppos'd to have been made by *Ezra*,
 and confirm our Opinion, although some Things
 are advanced there, which may be justly doubted
 of: Neither are his other Considerations of any
 Weight, in which he desires to persuade us,
 that there was a Change of the Letters although
 of a later Date. For

First, What he presseth in his *sixth* Observa-
 tion, about the meaning of the *Jews*, which
 differing from their Words, lay concealed in
 their Testimony, rests upon a vain and foolish
 Conjecture, which no Man but Mr. *Whiston* could
 devise: And when he cannot cite so much as one
Jew concurring with him, he misinterprets their
 Words, and ascribes an Opinion to them, di-
 rectly contrary. Therefore, the Suspicion about
 those Things which are ascrib'd to *Ezra*, and the
Sanhedrin,

Sanbedrin, by its own Weakness falls to the Ground.

Secondly, I wish our Adversary had quoted the Testimony of *Origen*, about the *Forehead Plate* of the High-Priest, with a *Samaritan* Inscription upon it, that we might examine and consider it, and might understand what the Words of *Origen* were, and of what Import and Weight his Testimony may be. For although *Origen* be by far too late, that we should either stand or fall by his Authority, in a Question of a Matter of Fact transacted an Age and a Half before his Time; yet *Jerom* is sufficient to prevent our believing that any such thing could drop from him. For though he ordinarily follows *Origen*, both in the Point of the *Jewish* Letters and Antiquities, yet he testifies as to the *golden Plate* of the *High-Priest*, that it had the Name of God engraven in those four Letters, י Yod, ה He, ו Vau, ה He.

Thirdly, The second Testimony of *Origen* taken from *Montfaucon*, runs thus: τὸ ἀνεκφώνητον, τετραγράμματος ἐν τοῖς ἀρχαίοις καὶ ἀντιγραφῶν Ἐβραϊκοῖς ἀρχαίοις γράμμασι γέγραπται, ἀλλ' ἐν τοῖς νῦν φασὶ καὶ Ἐσδρα ἐτέροις χρῆσασθαι καὶ ἀσχηματίαν. That ineffable Name of four Letters, in the most accurate Copies, is written in the ancient Hebrew Letters, but not in these modern ones: For they say that *Esdras* made use of others after the Captivity. But that is taken out of a *Catena* upon the *Psalms*, which is in Manuscript in the Royal Library at *Paris*, num. 1818. And it cannot be ascribed to *Origen* with any Certainty, since the Works of *Origen* have suffer'd so many Depravations, Corrections, and remarkable Da-

mages, that from a Fragment of that Kind, carrying only his Name, no firm and solid Arguments can be drawn. Moreover, this Fragment, such as it is, is against Mr. *Whiston*, for it imputes that pretended change of the Letters to *Ezra*.

Fourthly, As to the *Greek Copies*, which exhibit the Name יהוה *Jehovah*, written in the *Samaritan Character*, the Place cited out of *Jerom*, is no wise plain. For after he had spoken of that common Tradition, concerning the old *Hebrew Letters* being rejected, and new ones invented by *Ezra*, next he treats of the Number of the *Hebrew Letters*, and reckons up what Chapters of the Scripture, and what *Psalms*, run in the *Acrostick Way*, according to the Order of the *Hebrew Alphabet*. And among these, says he, we find the Name of the Lord, the Tetragrammaton, in some *Greek Books*, express'd in ancient Letters even to this present Time. Here you read nothing of the *Samaritan Character*. But suppose with Mr. *Whiston*, that by the ancient Letters the *Samaritan* are to be understood, yet nothing certain can be concluded from the Practice of some *Greek Editors*. For how unskilfully they writ the *Hebrew Letters*, the above-named ^a *Montfaucon* informs us, in a particular Specimen produced by him; so that you make yourself more absurd than those absurd Copists, when you think to get any Assurance of the genuine Figure of the *Hebrew Letters* from the *Greek Copies*.

Fifthly, ^r We have formerly spoken of the *Samaritan Shekels* at large, and judge it not necessary to add any thing more to what was then said,

^a Præliminarium in Hexapla Origenis, cap. 2. S. 2. p. 22.

^r Crit. Sac. cit. loc. 'Ex^o 4. ad Objection. 1.

by insisting upon the Distinction between the common and vulgar *Hebrew* Character, and the sacred and more solemn one.

Sixtly, We have also in a proper Place * diligently and copiously treated of the Origine, and Causes, and Age of the *Chaldee* Translations; so that by comparing of those things with what is said about the *Chaldeisms* used in the Bible, the Queries propos'd by Mr. *Whiston* may be blown away with a Breath, and the *Jews* easily vindicated from the Charge of abolishing the *Hebrew* Copy laid against them. For whatever he trifles here in favour of his Hypothesis, is intirely owing to his own Invention, unsupported by Antiquity, and without so much as any Colour to countenance it. Neither is it to be doubted, but the learned will judge, that Mr. *Whiston* hath taken a great Deal of Pains to very little Purpose. For if the Bibles were written in no other Character but the *Samaritan*, even to the second Century, what Man in his right Wits can possibly believe, that all the Copies of that Sort, the *Pentateuch* only excepted; should be totally abolished by the *Jews* (exterminated, dispers'd, oppress'd, starv'd, disgrac'd and reproach'd all the World over) so that not so much as one Copy could escape the general Calamity; when in the mean Time it cannot be denied, that very many of them were in Possession of the *Christians* of *Syria* and *Palestine*. He who shall compare the calamitous Circumstances of the *Jewish* Nation at that Juncture of Time, captivated and exil'd, with the very great Multitude of *Christians*, and their diligent Study of the holy Scriptures, will never draw any such Conclusion from it, as Mr. *Whiston* has done.

* Crit. sacr. part. ii. cap. i. * Partis i. cap. 5. sectione ultimâ.

C H A P. VI.

About the Spuriousness of the Samaritan Pentateuch.

FROM the preceding Hypothesis, about the original Antiquity of the Samaritan Character, this second Position naturally flows: For, as it is commonly said, one Absurdity being admitted, many more do of Consequence follow after. Accordingly, Mr. Whiston thus declares in his

PROPOSITION VI. Page 164.

The Samaritan Pentateuch, even as now among us, is generally a faithful and uncorrupt Copy of the five Books of Moses, as that Pentateuch was extant, both in Hebrew and Greek, in the Days of Christ and his Apostles.

“ FOR, says he, 1. it was written in the same
 “ old Hebrew Character, in which the Books
 “ of Moses ever were extant, till the Beginning
 “ of the second Century, and so has never been
 “ exposed to these Alterations, which the Change
 “ of the Jewish Pentateuch from one Character
 “ to another might occasion.

“ 2. Besides, the Samaritans had so great an
 “ Abhorrence of the Jews, that those Corrup-
 “ tions which the Jews brought into their own
 “ Copies,

“ Copies, would no way affect the Samaritan
 “ Copies.

“ 3. Neither had the Samaritans much concern
 “ with the *Christians*, and therefore had no such
 “ Disputes and Debates with them, as the *Jews*
 “ had, which might tempt them to corrupt the
 “ sacred Copies, to the End that they might
 “ oppose the *Christians* with the greater Force.

“ 4. If any Man compare the Samaritan Co-
 “ py with the *Masorete Hebrew*, according to
 “ the Rules of Criticism, he will easily find that
 “ the former is the true one. For the *Hebrew*
 “ hath very frequently *הוּ* Hu, *he*, for *הוּ* He,
 “ *she*, contrary to common Sense; but the Sa-
 “ maritan never. The *Hebrew* has always *Ben-*
 “ *jamin* with a *Chaldee* Termination, which de-
 “ notes or signifies a *Son of the right Hand*, with-
 “ out any good Sense at all; while the *Samari-*
 “ *tan* has it always with an *Hebrew* Termination
 “ *Benjamim*, which agrees to *Philo*, and the old
 “ *Jewish* Etymology, a *Son of Days*, viz. of
 “ old Age, which agrees well with him who was
 “ the youngest of all *Jacob's* Sons, being born
 “ to him in his old Age: *Mr. Whiston* says, that
 “ many such Examples may be taken out of his
 “ Appendix.

“ 5. By comparing the *Hebrew* Copies and
 “ the Samaritan with the *Septuagint* Version, al-
 “ though it be corrupted at present, it will ap-
 “ pear that it often confirms the Samaritan Text
 “ against the *Hebrew*. And it is not to be
 “ doubted, if at present we had the uncorrupted
 “ Copy of this Translation, but that it would
 “ much more frequently confirm the reading of
 “ the Samaritan *Pentateuch*.

“ 6. There are near thirty large Passages, or
 “ thirty long Repetitions, in the Samaritan *Penta-*
 “ *teuch*, which the modern *Hebrew* wants: nei-
 “ ther

“ ther can any Reason be assign’d why they were
 “ added in the *Samaritan*; but of the Omission
 “ in the *Hebrew*, the Reason is obvious, because
 “ they appear’d to be of no use. Whence it is
 “ evident, that the *Samaritan* is the full and
 “ compleat Copy, but that the *Hebrew* in these
 “ and other Places abridges the History, and o-
 “ mits some Part of the same.

“ 7. The Chronology of the *Samaritan Penta-*
 “ *teuch*, from the Creation of the World to the
 “ Death of *Moses*, is plainly and evidently the
 “ true Chronology, confirm’d from Antiquity
 “ by the *Hebrew* Copies which *Josephus* used,
 “ and by the *Septuagint* Reading as it stood
 “ before the second Century; for that in the
 “ succeeding Ages it was corrupted, Mr. *Whi-*
 “ *ston* pretends that he hath already demon-
 “ strated.

“ 8. The Citations of the *Pentateuch* in the
 “ New Testament, in *Josephus*, the *Constitutions*,
 “ and the *Apostolick Fathers* also, generally a-
 “ gree with the *Samaritan* Copy, but especial-
 “ ly where they differ from the present *Hebrew*
 “ and *Greek* Copies. Mr. *Whiston* doubts, whe-
 “ ther the *Samaritans* have admitted any one
 “ voluntary Corruption in their whole *Penta-*
 “ *teuch*: He also judgeth, that the Number of
 “ involuntary Errors since the first Century, are
 “ not very considerable. So that there remains
 “ no Doubt of the Accuracy and Integrity of
 “ the *Samaritan Pentateuch*; and that it is the
 “ most authentick Record of Antiquity, and the
 “ most valuable Treasure remaining in the whole
 “ *Christian* World, relating to the Times before
 “ the coming of *Christ*. Upon this Occasion, he
 “ with all his might contends, that in *Exod. xx.*
 “ *17.* and *Deut. xxvii. 4.* we ought not to read
 “ *Mount Ebal*, according to the *Hebrew*, but
 “ *Gerizim*,

"Gerizim, with the Samaritan Copy:" We shall e'er long, particularly consider and discuss his Reasons.

ANSW. But these Considerations are of no such Weight as to persuade us to come into his Opinion. For his three *first* Reasons built upon false *Hypotheses*, stand upon a sandy Foundation; which being removed, they fall of themselves. The *fourth* discovers Mr. *Whiston's* false Judgment in Criticism: For in the demonstrative Pronoun, the Masculine is not put for the Feminine: But only *Vau*, and *Yod*, are changed, according to the common Usage of the Letters אהו. And as *Buxtorf*, *Altingius*, and *Wasmuthus*, after the *Masorab* observe, instead of הוה *He*, in the *Pentateuch*, is put always and every where הוה *He*, eleven Places only excepted, in which we have הוה *He*. And the same Permutation of Letters frequently occurs in the other Books of Scripture; viz, 1 King. xvii. 15. ותאכל הוא והיא ותאכל *And she, and he, and her House did eat many Days*, [or a full Year] כי הוא זמרה והיא עו *For it is a Wickedness, and it is an Iniquity of, or in the Judges, &c.* But the Point under written doth not suffer the Genders to be confounded, and changed one for the other; but it plainly points out to us, in what Gender the Pronoun is to be taken. Therefore the *Samaritan Copy*, wanting Points, must of Necessity make us know by the Letters themselves, what Gender the Reading requires, lest the Reader be confounded, or hang in suspense, and in this Instance it confirms the Antiquity of the Points. Therefore it is no wonder, that the *Samaritan* writes it הוה, when the *Hebrew Text* hath it הוה: For wanting Points, it could not be written otherwise. Neither are

the Pretences about the Name of *Benjamin*, of any greater Moment: For, as he ignorantly assigns a *Chaldee* Plural Termination to the Word *בן* *Jamin*, when it is really Singular, so with equal Absurdity doth he obtrude a new and strange Signification upon the Name, by rendering it, instead of a Son of the *right Hand*, a Son of *Days*. In this he seems to have follow'd *Le Clerc's* Interpretation, who after he had given three Etymologies of the Name, at length fixes upon the last. " Finally, (says he) others " think that he was called a Son of *Days*, i. e. " of *old Age*; as *בן* *Jamin*, may be a *Chaldee* " plural, for the *Hebrew* *בנים* *Jamim*, and " this needs not to be wonder'd at in a Man, who " had lately return'd from *Chaldea*. Thus after- " ward, ^z, *Benjamin* is called the Son of his old " Age." But there he is not called *בן* *Ben*, a Son, but in a Sense very different *בן זקנים* *Jal- led Zakanem*, born in his Fathers old Age. Moreover, this Explanation of the Name is against the very Genius of the Language. For the Word *בנים* *Jamim*, in the Description or Naming of a Man, subjoin'd to another Word, attributes Days, Years, Age or Antiquity, to the Person of whom it is predicated, and not to his Father; as is evident from the Analogy of the Language, and from like Examples. For instance, when in *Dan. vii. 9.* we read *בן* *pry* *Gnatick Jamin*, the Ancient of Days, full of Days, a Man of Days, &c. in like Manner as a Son of Days, it means rather an aged Man, and one advanc'd in Years, than one born to his Father when he was an old Man. Therefore both *Jewish* and *Christian* Interpreters, upon all Occasions, although they may disagree in the Explication of the Name, some under-

^z Comm. in Gen. xxxv. 18.

^z Cap. xlii. 20.

standing it of the South Quarter with *Raschi*, others with *Abarbenel*, of Strength, of which the right Hand is a Symbol, others with *Hillerus*, of the Power of God, who brought the Child out of his Mother's Womb, when she was labouring, and in great Danger in Child-birth, others with *Benedict. Carpzovius*, of a certain Prerogative and Excellence, of which the right Hand is an Emblem; yet almost all of them concur in this, that not the plural Number from the Noun יָמִין *Yom*, Day, but יָמִין *Jamin*, right Hand, the Hebrew Noun singular in this Place makes up the Compound: And after the same Manner, as is said *Psal. lxxx. 17.* יָמִין עֲשֵׂה *Eesh Jamin*, a Man of thy right Hand, so here, accordingly is said יָמִין בֶּן *Benjamin*, a Son of the right Hand. * Yea, some of our Communion carrying the Thought further, and well observing, that the *Patriarchs* very often in imposing Names upon their Sons, had a particular View to the *Messiah*, do alledge, that *Jacob* intended in his youngest Son a Memorial of the *Messiah*, who was to be *Benoni*, or the Son of Sorrow, in his Passion and Death, *Isa. liii. 3.* and *Benjamin*, Son of the right Hand, in his Exaltation to the right Hand of the Father: All which typical Representation is lost, if you interpret this Name, Son of Days.

Mr. *Whiston's* fifth Argument may be sufficiently answer'd from what we have ^b elsewhere said, to which there is no need of adding any more. ^c

^y Onomast. via 7, p. 300.
f. 366.

^a Only perhaps, Francis Burman [in Exeges. Gen. xxxv. Edit. Belgicæ, p. 254.] and his Follower here, as also often elsewhere, Joh. Bierman [in Typorum explicatione quam Moses in Christus inscripsit Lib. 1. cap. 4. p. 64.] after the common Interpretation of Son of the right Hand, adds the other, of Son of old Age, and seems to approve it.

^b Crit. Sacr. Cap. 2. S. 4. 'Exb'. 2.

^c The Author's Re-

As to his *sixth* Argument, from the superfluous Passages and Repetitions in the *Samaritan*, which are not in the *Hebrew Copy*, such as *Gen.* iv. 8. x. 19. xi. 31. xxx. 36. xlii. 16. *Exod.* vi. 9. vii. 18. viii. 4, 23. ix. 5, 19. x. 6. xi. 7. xii. 40. xviii. 24, 25. xx. 17, 19, 21. xxii. 5. xxiii. 19, 28. xxix. 5. *Levit.* xvii. 4. *Numb.* iv. 14. x. 10. xii. 16. xiii. 33. xx. 13. xxi. 11, 12, 20, 22, 23. xxvii. 23. xxxi. 24. *Deut.* ii. 7. iv. 21. x. 6, 7, 8. These indeed are sometimes very large ones; but they are rather to be look'd upon as Glosses, taken from what goes before or after; or sometimes, also from parallel Places, that were only marked upon the Margin, but afterwards admitted into the Text, and sometimes supported by the Authority of the *Septuagint*. Most of them appear too impertinent and trifling to be worthy of the *Holy Ghost*, betraying the indiscreet Forwardness of Criticks, or the Ignorance of the Co-

ference here is to his *Critica Sacra*, p. 503. where he gives an Account of the *Septuagint's* harmonizing so often with the *Samaritan*. He assigns two probable Causes of it: 1. The first is, that upon Onias's building a Temple within the Prefecture of Heliopolis [before Christ 140.] for the Jews in Egypt, like to that of Jerusalem, there insued grievous Animosities, between the Jews of Palestine and those of Egypt: Upon which Occasion, the Alexandrian Jews, in Opposition to the other, struck in with the Samaritans, and sided the closer with them. Hence it might easily come to pass (which Rabbi Asariah asserts to be really Fact; Meor Eneijem. p. 49.) that the Alexandrians might studiously shape their Greek Version to the Samaritan Copy, not regarding their other more ancient Hebrew Copies. 2. A second Cause assigned is, that Origen having taken into his Hexapla the Versions of Symmachus and Theodotion (who were both Samaritans) by Degrees, as the Marks of Distinction wore out, or were neglected, several Pieces of those Versions crept into the Text of the *Septuagint*, and thrust out the true *Septuagint* reading in those Places: And from hence also the later Copies of the *LXX* might come to have more of a Samaritan Cast, and agree more with the *Samaritan* than with the *Hebrew Copies*.

MOSES MARCUS.

pists;

pists; and shewing, that the *Samaritan* Text is very faulty, and has so many Corruptions; so far are they from proving its undoubted Authority. Indeed, if the Case had been quite the Reverse, and if such Tautologies and vain Repetitions had been read in the *Hebrew* Copy, instead of the *Samaritan*, I do not doubt but Mr. *Whiston* would have turn'd it to the Reproach of the *Hebrew*, and upon that very Account, would have endeavour'd to sink its Authority below the *Samaritan*: Now, since the Fact is otherwise, he has Confidence enough to turn those interpolated Pieces, very fillily, to his own Advantage, and from thence to draw an Argument against the *Hebrew* Copies.

Seventhly, As to his Pleas, from the Harmony of the *Samaritan Chronology*, with that of *Josephus* and the *Septuagint*, they are manifestly false, and have been above discuss'd by us^d: But we shall presently speak more of those Matters, where we are purposely to treat of *Josephus*.

Eighthly, As to the Citations out of this *Pentateuch*, both in the New Testament, and also in the *Apostolick Constitutions*, and *Fathers*, we have said more than enough before, which it is altogether needless to repeat here: especially considering, that no solid Conclusion can be drawn from this Argument, for Confirmation of one Reading or over-turning another.

In the remaining Part of his Discourse, Mr. *Whiston* leaves no Stone unturn'd, carefully to wipe off the Charge of Corruption made against the *Samaritan Pentateuch*, for confounding the Names of the two Mountains, *Ebal* and *Gerizim*, taking all imaginable Pains to remove the Imputation of Error, which in a former Discourse we^e have

^d Cap. 1. ad proposit. 3. S. 1. ^e Crit. Sacr. p. 2.
Cap. 4. S. 3. 'Ex^o. 3.

proved upon it. For he declares, that the *Samaritan* reading, concerning an Altar built upon Mount *Gerizim*, is genuine and true, but that the *Hebrew*, *Exod. xx.* is mutilated and imperfect, and that in *Deut. xxvii. 4.* it is also vitiated and erroneous, and this he endeavours to make good by Arguments. For that

First, "In all other Cases, the *Samaritans* cannot be censured but the *Jews*; which makes it unreasonable to charge the Corruption upon the *Samaritans* without evident Proof." But to this we

ANSW. This is τὸ ἐν ἀρχῇ λαμβάνειν, is begging of the Question. For Antiquity with one Consent denies, that the *Jews* industriously corrupted the sacred Copies; and *Jerom*, *Buxtorf*, *Glassius*, and even among the Papists, *Bellarmino*, have at full length refuted this Accusation: And we have proved in our first Part of *Crit. Sacra*, that the Copies have suffer'd no general Corruption, but we have both observ'd and made it good by Examples, that the *Samaritan* Copies are corrupted in more Places than one; so that this Argument might be turn'd against himself.

Moreover, Secondly, "That it seems most agreeable to the Nature of Things, that the Altar for divine Worship and Sacrifice, as well as for the Inscription of Laws, which is here concern'd, should be at the Mountain appointed for the Blessings, as *Gerizim* was; and not at that appointed for the Curses, as was *Ebal*."

ANSW. That Agreeableness is only to be found in Mr. *Whiston's* Brain. For as the Curses belong to the Law, as much as the Blessings, neither are the latter more nearly allied to it than the former, so no Reason appears, why that Memorial of the Law should be more applicable to Mount

Mount *Gerizim* than to Mount *Ebal*: Where by the way also I observe, that the Memorial of the Law, *Deut.* xxvii. 4. and *Josh.* viii. 32. is said to have been written not upon the Altar, which was built for the offering of Sacrifices, but upon Stones, set up for this very Purpose, contrary to Mr. *Whiston's* Opinion. Accordingly, they were commanded to build their Altars of rough Stones, but those on which the Law was to be written, were to be smooth'd over with Plaister. Upon this Account we cannot consent to *Josephus*, who says, that the Law was written upon the Altar itself.

Thirdly, " That this seems to be the very
 " Place where *Joshua* set up a Stone for a Witness
 " unto the *Israelites*, because, as he speaks, it
 " had heard all the Words of the Lord which he
 " spake unto them: which was expressly at *Shechem*,
 " or close by Mount *Gerizim*, and not at
 " Mount *Ebal*.

ANSW. But what is that to the Purpose? Because the Sanctuary of the Lord was at *Shechem*, *Josh.* xxiv. 26. therefore *Joshua* called all *Israel* thither before the Lord, *vs.* 2. and bound them by a religious Oath and Covenant, to persevere in the true Worship of God, after his Death, and the Death of the *Elders* who were to survive him. So then *Joshua* having at that Place summon'd the People by Command, and in the Name of God; and the whole Multitude, in a solemn Form and Ceremony, having again devoted themselves to the true Religion, and the ancient and customary sacred Offices of the Patriarchs; *Joshua*, with good Reason, says, that the Stone of Witness heard the Words of the Lord, pronounced by himself, by Inspiration and Command of God. But pray, how can it be from thence concluded, that the Stone Monument of the Law, *Deut.* xxvii. was built at Mount *Gerizim*, and not at *Ebal*? But if
 Mr.

Mr. *Whiston* had desired to give any Light to that Precept of *Deut.* xxvii. from the Book of *Joshua*, he should have sent his Reader to *Joshua* viii. 30, &c. where the Execution of that Command is described, and both the Altar and the Stones of Remembrance, are expressly plac'd at Mount *Ebal*: And by this the genuine reading of *Moses*, is confirm'd beyond all Exception. Moreover, he mistakes in this, that he makes the Stone erected at *Shechem*, to be close to *Gerizim*, and at farther Distance from *Ebal*. For the ancient and modern Writers, who have visited these Places, do testify, that *Shechem*, which in later Ages is called *Neapolis*, is situated in the Middle of a Valley, between both these Mountains. Certainly, ^f *Josephus* affirms, ^g Σικίμων πόλιν μεταξύ δυοῖν ὄρεσιν, Γαριζὴν μὲν ἑκ δεξιῶν κειμένη, ἡ δὲ ἐν αὐτῶν Γεβαὶς προσαγορεύομένη, that the City of *Shechem* is situated between two Mountains; *Gerizim* upon the Right, and *Ebal* upon the left Hand. And ^h *Benjamin Tudelensis* confirms the same: From hence (from *Sebaste*) I came to *Neapolis*, which is *Shechem*, והנה ישבר בן הר גריזים and it lies in the Valley, between Mount *Gerizim* and Mount *Ebal*. And ⁱ *Maundrel*, one of the latest Writers, owns this; as also ^j *Johann. Cotovicius*, a learned Author, who was above a hundred Years before him, where ^k he at large maintains this Situation of the City against *Jerom*. Add to this, that we have no Testimony from holy Scripture, at what Place, or toward what Corner of the City this Pillar of Stone was erected by *Joshua*, whether on the Southside, in which was Mount *Gerizim*, or upon the North, toward which

^f Lib. iv. Antiqu. cap. 8.

^g Itinerarii pag. 38.

^h In Itinerar. pag. 103. Edit. Gallicæ.

ⁱ Itinerarii Hierosolom.

& Syriaci Lib. 3. cap. 4. p. 338, &c.

^j In Locis Hebr.

Ebal stood; so that Mr. *Whiston* very precipitately, and without Authority, declares for *Gerizim*. He proceeds in his Way of arguing:

Fourthly, “ That when the Woman of *Samaria* said to our Saviour, from her *Samaritan Pentateuch*, That their Fathers worshipped in that Mountain of *Gerizim*; which probably refers to this very Matter, and these very Texts; Our Saviour’s Answer seems to allow from his *Jewish Pentateuch*, that what she said was true.

ANSW. What Mr. *Whiston* supposeth the Woman of *Samaria* to speak, about Sacrifices offer’d in this Mountain, or about this very Text of *Deut. xxvii.* concerning which we are enquiring, is not proved, but is much to be questioned. For in general she enquires about the solemn Place of Worship and Adoration, which by the *Jews* was esteem’d to be the Temple of *Jerusalem*, and by the *Samaritans* Mount *Gerizim*: But it doth not appear that she makes any Reference to the Law having been read between these two opposite Mountains, or an Altar built upon either of them. But what chiefly deserves Censure, is our Adversary’s Fiction, that *Christ*’s Answer approved the Woman’s Tradition, about the Worship of her Nation, and proves the Agreement between the *Samaritan* Reading, (about Mount *Gerizim*’s being dedicated to Adoration) and the *Hebrew*, as if at that time it harmonized with the other. For what the *Samaritans* pleaded as to this Mountain, on the one Hand was founded upon a Corruption of the Text, and on the other Hand, it carried in it manifest *Will-Worship* and Superstition. *Christ* cannot, without Blasphemy, be said to have approved of both of these Things: Neither ought it to be suffered, that *Christ* should be said to testify, that this *Samaritan* Tradition agreed with the *Hebrew Pentateuch*, which is known to have appointed

appointed another and a quite different Place for the publick Worship of the Old Testament. Indeed while *Moses* was alive, God did not determine any particular Place, but forewarned them, that he would chuse one at a proper Time, *Exod. xx. 24. Deut. xii. 5, 11.* Accordingly, as soon as they enter'd into *Canaan*, first indeed it was his Will to be worshipped in *Shiloh*, *Josh. xviii. 1. Jerem. vii. 12.* But that being forsaken, a firm and permanent Resting-place for holy Offices at length succeeded, at *Jerusalem* upon Mount *Moriah*, which God chose to himself out of all the Tribes of *Israel*, that he might place his Name there, *1 Kings viii. 16, 44, 48. ix. 3. xi. 13. xiv. 21.* And that Constitution was not to be reversed, because the *Messiah* was to be revealed, and the Foundation of his Kingdom to be laid there, *Mal. iii. 1, &c.* Therefore, if *Christ* had approved any other Mountain, particularly *Gerizim*, as dedicated to, and initiated in the Service of God, he had thereby discredited many Scripture Prophecies, and had sapped the Foundations of the *Jewish* Church, and overthrown the Hope of *them who wait for the Consolation of Israel.* But how unsuitable such a Supposition is to the Mouth of Truth, of a Prophet raised up by God, the faithful and true Witness, every Man must needs understand, without my hinting it. He adds,

Fifthly, " I see no other sufficient Reason for
 " the *Samaritan's* Choice of Mount *Gerizim* be-
 " fore Mount *Ebal*, but because the ancient Place
 " for Worship was in their old genuine Copies
 " *Gerizim*, and not *Ebal*. For had it been other-
 " wise, they would naturally have made Choice
 " of *Ebal*, which was but a little way from *She-*
 " *chem* and *Gerizim*, and recommended by their
 " *Pentateuch*; which would in that case have
 " served their Turn as well as the other.

ANSW.

ANSW. As to the Reason which moved the *Samaritans* to perform their holy Offices upon *Gerizim* rather than upon *Ebal*, we have no Intimation of it, except it were the ancient Depravation of the Copies themselves. And we judge that they brought this Corruption into their Copies, either when the Temple of *Gerizim* was building by *Sanballat*, or when publick Worship was first set up in it after it was built. For it was necessary to procure some Authority and Credit to it; and because it was well known from the Law, *Levit. xvii. 4.* that Sacrifices would be allowed and accepted by God only in one Place; they saw that there would be an End of all their Worship, unless they claimed to their own Temple that Dignity which belonged to *Jerusalem*. That it might be thought they did this by divine Approbation, they laid violent Hands upon the Text; and they could with Ease spread that Corruption through all their Copies, which were but few, and were confined within the Bounds of their own Nation, and in the Hands of the Corrupters themselves. To this may be added the different State of those Mountains; one of them, *Gerizim*, was fruitful, well water'd and pleasant; on the contrary, the other, *Ebal*, was full of Caves, frightful, rocky and barren, as *Cotovicus*, of whom we spoke before, testifies. But as to the Time and Manner of this Corruption, we have spoken at large in the ¹ Place we before referred to: And ^m *Adrianus Relandus* hath with Learning and Accuracy treated of Mount *Gerizim*.

Sixthly, "It seems to me that *Josephus* the *Jewish* Historian, read in his *Hebrew* Copy the

¹ Crit. Sacr. p. 2. c. 4. Sect. 3. 'E. 3. 3. cellan. 3. p. 121, &c.

^m Dissert. Misc.

" same

“ same that the Samaritans still read in theirs ;
 “ and to have had here *Gerizim*, and not *Ebal*.
 “ For ^a he informs us, that this Altar was in a
 “ Plain between Mount *Gerizim* and Mount *Ebal* ;
 “ and particularly, *not far from Shechem*, & *ἡ πό-
 “ ῖς τῆς Σικκίμων πόλεως*. This last Designation is in
 “ the Samaritan, but not in the Hebrew Copy ;
 “ and agreeable to the Situation of *Gerizim*, close
 “ by *Shechem*. *Josephus*’s present Copies are
 “ made agreeable to our present Hebrew, that
 “ this Altar was on Mount *Ebal* : Which contra-
 “ dicts what he had said before, of its being
 “ between the two Mountains ; so that the Word
 “ *Ebal*, is an Interpolation or Correction made
 “ in Favour of the Hebrew and Greek Copies
 “ which has been often done, &c.

ANSW. If this be not using Violence with an
 Author, I know not what is so. He drags in *Jo-
 sephus* to take part with the Samaritans against his
 own Words. For, *First*, He places the Altar
 between the two Mountains near to *Shechem* ;
 and, *Secondly*, in express Terms upon that Side
 of the City which looked towards Mount *Ebal* ;
 and *Thirdly*, he tells us, that *Moses* prohibited
 the offering Sacrifices afterwards in that Place ;
 hereby declaring, that all the Worship after this
 perform’d by the Samaritans at Mount *Gerizim*
 was unlawful, and contrary to the Command of
Moses, or rather of God himself : *Τὰὐτ’ ἐν Μαύσῃς
 διατάξε, μετ’ ἐνείκῃ τῆς ἐκείνου οὐκ ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκείνου ἐπέ-
 ρον*. Therefore *Moses* commanded them, after that
 Day not to offer another Sacrifice there. So that if
 the Reading of Mount *Ebal* be interpolated in *Jo-
 sephus*, and *Gerizim* should be put in its Place,
Josephus must condemn and proscribe in the ve-
 ry Words of *Moses*, all the sacred Offices of the

^a Lib. IV. Antiq. cap. ult. S. 44.

Samaritans performed in that Place ; so far is he from confirming them. Moreover, there is no such Contradiction, as he pretends in the History of *Josephus*. For the Altar might well have been in the Valley, and also between the two Mountains, yet nearer to Mount *Ebal*; and towards the City of *Shechem*, but upon that Side of it which faced Mount *Ebal*. From all which it appears, that there is no Reason to believe its Reading to be interpolated, or that it hath been any way corrupted.

C H A P. VII.

Of the Citations of the Texts of the Bible, in the Writings of the Fathers of the ancient Church.

Mr. *Whiston's* Design here is plain from

PROPOSITION VIII. P. 176.

Philo the Jew, the sacred Authors of the New Testament, the Apostolical Fathers, with the primitive Greek and Latin Writers now extant, of almost four entire Centuries, do every one make their Citations out of the Old Testament, not from the Hebrew Original, but the Septuagint Version thereof; or from some Latin Translations made according to that Septuagint Version.

i. **A**FTER this Manner does he endeavour to prove his *Proposition*:

First, "It was hardly possible for the Apostles
S
"them-

“ themselves, much less for some of their Com-
 “ panions, to cite the *Hebrew* Original so fre-
 “ quently and readily as they had Occasion to do
 “ in the Books of the New Testament, because
 “ they had been many Years preaching the Gos-
 “ pel out of *Judea*, and among the *Syrians*
 “ and *Greeks*, before they began to write those
 “ Books. For from *A.D.* 34 or 35, when the
 “ Apostles were first dispersed abroad to preach
 “ the Gospel out of the Bounds of *Judea*, till *A.D.*
 “ 56 or 57, when the former Epistle to the *Co-*
 “ *rinthians*, the earliest Book of the present New
 “ Testament, was written, is at the least twenty
 “ one Years: Now a Disuse of the *Hebrew*, and
 “ Use of the *Greek*, during the one half of this
 “ Time, seem sufficient to make any Person
 “ very unready in such Citations, how ready so-
 “ ever he might have been formerly at them.

Secondly, “ When the sacred Pen-men men-
 “ tion some Expressions out of our Saviour *ver-*
 “ *batim*, as he spake them, whether taken out of
 “ the Old Testament or no, they do it not ac-
 “ cording to the proper *Hebrew*, but according
 “ to the then current *Syriack*. This is most re-
 “ markable in our Saviour’s Words on the Cross,
 “ *Eli Eli*, or *Eloi Eloi*, *Lama Sabachthani*:
 “ which though taken from the *xxii Psalm*, is
 “ in the *Syriack*, and not in the *Hebrew* Lan-
 “ guage.

Thirdly, “ It would have been absurd in the
 “ Apostles, who generally preach’d and wrote in
 “ *Greek*, and for the Use of those who under-
 “ stood *Greek*, to have quoted any other than the
 “ *Greek Bible*, then every where and alone cur-
 “ rent among them; just as it would be absurd
 “ for an *English* Preacher and Writer, in Sermons
 “ and Books composed for the Use of the *English*
 “ Nation, to quote the vulgar *Latin Bible*; or

“ indeed

“ indeed any other than that *English* Bible, which
 “ was every where and alone current among them.
 “ Citations in another Language could not make
 “ any considerable Impression upon the People.
 “ This he speaks only in respect of the unlearned,
 “ with whom the Apostles had most to do, and not
 “ of the Learned, with whom they seldom met;
 “ and of whom no particular Notice is taken in any
 “ such Citations, through the whole N. Testament.

Fourthly, “ Mr. *Whiston* pretends to have proved
 “ before, in *Prop. II.* that the *Hebrew* and
 “ *Greek* Bibles did excellently agree together,
 “ and were universally known to do so in the
 “ apostolical Age: So that there could be then lit-
 “ tle or no Occasion for the Apostles or their
 “ Companions to recede from the common *Sep-*
 “ tuagint Bible, and to have Recourse to the *He-*
 “ brew Original in any of their Citations of the
 “ Old Testament.

Fifthly, “ It is plain in Fact, that generally
 “ speaking, the Writers of the New Testament
 “ do quote the *Septuagint* Version of the Old Te-
 “ stament, even as it is now extant, and not the
 “ *Hebrew* Original; as any one that compares
 “ them together must immediately observe. Nor
 “ would any of the Learned have thought other-
 “ wise of the rest of the Citations, if the *Hebrew*
 “ Original and the *Septuagint* Version had as uni-
 “ versally agreed together in the latter Ages, as
 “ they now appear to have done in the first A-
 “ ges of the Gospel.

Sixthly, “ It is also particularly plain in Fact,
 “ that the only three sacred Writers, who were in
 “ Circumstances the most likely to induce them to
 “ quote the *Hebrew*, and not the *Septuagint Greek*;
 “ namely, St. *Matthew*, who is allow'd to have
 “ written his Gospel for the Use of the *Jews* in
 “ *Judea*; St. *James*, who was Bishop of *Jerusa-*
 “ *lem*;

“ *lem*; and *St. Barnabas*, who as well as *St. James*,
 “ particularly addressed his Epistle to the *Jews*
 “ themselves; do yet generally, if not always,
 “ quote from the *Greek* Version, and not from
 “ the *Hebrew* Original, as any one may easily see
 “ upon the Comparison.

Seventbly, “ It does not appear certain, either
 “ by any particular Indication of the sacred Wri-
 “ ters of the New Testament when they cite the
 “ Old, or by the Texts and Citations compared
 “ together, that there is one single Text pro-
 “ perly cited from the *Hebrew*, as distinct from
 “ the *Septuagint* Version; even while those Cita-
 “ tions, or almost equivalent Allusions are in
 “ Number about 500.

Eighbly, “ All the primitive Writers, who could
 “ see any of the Apostles, or any Companion of the
 “ Apostles, did ever suppose, that the Writers of
 “ the New Testament took their Citations, not
 “ out of the *Hebrew* Original, but out of the *Sep-*
 “ *tuagint* Version. *Irenæus* is express in this
 “ Matter. *Mr. Whiston* thinks, that there is not
 “ any Pretence from Christian Antiquity, for al-
 “ most four Centuries, to the contrary, &c.

Nintbly, “ We have at least one Book of the
 “ *Septuagint* Version, namely, the Psalms of *Da-*
 “ *vid*, still extant as it stood in the first Centu-
 “ ry °. Now there being no fewer than sixty
 “ eight Citations of, or equivalent Allusions to
 “ this Book in the New Testament, it will afford
 “ us a sure *καίτηρον*, by which we may deter-
 “ mine, whether the sacred Writers quoted the
 “ *Greek* or the *Hebrew*. And since all those Ci-
 “ tations, as will appear on the Comparison, do
 “ not only in Sense, but almost always in Words,
 “ agree to those *Greek* Psalms, even when they

“ much and often differ from the *Hebrew Con-*
 “ struction, and *Hebrew Copy*, there is no Room
 “ to doubt of the Truth of this *Proposition*, as to
 “ the rest of the Citations made by the same Au-
 “ thors, out of the like Books of the Old Testa-
 “ ment.

Tentbly, “ To conclude: The contrary Notion
 “ is a mere *Hypothesis*, taken up only to solve the
 “ remarkable Differences there now frequently
 “ are between the Citations in the New Testa-
 “ ment, and the Texts themselves in the present
 “ *Greek Copies* of the Old. But now, if such Dif-
 “ ficulties should be found, mainly, if not sole-
 “ ly, to be owing to the Alterations that have
 “ been made in that *Greek Version*, since those
 “ Quotations were made, as will soon be prov’d
 “ to be the Case, there will be little or no Oc-
 “ casion for any such *Hypothesis* at all: Nor in-
 “ deed, after that appears to be true, will any
 “ wise Man ever think of deriving those Cita-
 “ tions from the *Hebrew* any more.

ANSW. All he advanceth here, in his trifling
 Way, is partly foreign to the *Proposition*, pro-
 ving nothing from *Philo* and the *Apostolical Fa-*
thers, insisting only upon the Citations of the
 New Testament, which we have carefully consid-
 ered above P, so that what was there said, may
 suffice for refuting his Argument here; and part-
 ly is built upon such mean Trash, that it would
 almost turn ones Stomach to have to do with it,
 or examine it. But that our Author may have
 no Handle for Triumph, we shall briefly return
 an Answer to every single Article.

As to the *first*, it discovers either Mr. *Whi-*
ston's gross Ignorance, or great Maliciousness.
 For the Apostles and their Companions, to whom

was entrusted the Charge of preaching and writing the Gospel, being on one hand endowed with the Gift of Tongues, *Acts* ii. 4, &c. *Mark* xvi. 17. used any Language, or any Text of the Holy Scriptures, just as they pleased; and they lost not that Gift, by the disuse of any particular Language: On the other hand, whether they taught the Church by Word or by Writing, they were not left to their own natural Ability; but *ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι, ἐλάλησαν οἱ ἅγιοι θεῶ ἀνθρώποι, Holy Men of God, spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, 2 Pet. i. 21. οὐκ ἐν διδακτοῖς ἀνθρώπων σοφίας λόγοις, ἀλλ' ἐν διδακτοῖς πνεύματος ἁγίου, Not in the Words which Man's Wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth, 1 Cor. ii. 13.* So there is no fear, that the Use of the *Hebrew* Text should become hard and difficult to them, by many Years Disuse.

To the *second* and *third* we answer, when the Apostles explain'd the divine Mysteries to the People of *Palestine*, or to the *Syrians*, no doubt they used the *Syrian* or *Palestine* Dialect, as also the *Greek* Language to the *Greeks*; for they spoke to every Nation in their own Language or Mother Tongue, *Acts* ii. 6—8. Accordingly, they expressed the Testimonies of the Old Testament, by which they warranted what they delivered, in the same Language, and not in the *Hebrew*. But that is not the Question in hand: For the Subject of Enquiry is, Whether they took their Citations out of the *Hebrew* Copy, or the *Greek*? And what was the main Text to which they applied the Translation of that Language which they made use of? We have before shewed, that according as the Scope of their Discourse led them, sometimes they adhered closely to the *He-*

brew Text, at other Times they followed the *Greek*, and again when it was proper, made a new Translation, differing from both Copies.

As to the *fourth*, we have before ^r confuted and overthrown Mr. *Whiston's* false Supposition in his second Proposition, so that the Superstructure falls of itself.

As to the *fifth*, Mr. *Whiston* groundlessly asserts, that the Writers of the New Testament cite such a *Greek* Version as we at present have, as appears from what ^s we have observed against this Opinion; and it is farther plain from the *Hypothesis* of our pretended Critick himself, in which he pleads, that both the Texts of the Old Testament suffer'd divers remarkable Changes about the Beginning of the second Century. Whence it would follow, if the Fact were true, that the Citations of the Old Testament in the New, could not so often, or for the most part, agree with another Copy altogether different from that which the Writers of the New Testament used.

As to the *sixth*, it is altogether falsely asserted that St. *Matthew*, overlooking and neglecting the *Hebrew* Text, always cites the *Greek* Copy; for he is often found to differ from the *Septuagint*, and to agree with the *Hebrew*, viz. *Matth. iv. 4.* St. *Matthew* rehearses the Words of *Moses* exactly out of *Deut. viii. 3.* unless it be, that for making the Thing more clear, in the latter part of the *Hemistick*, he inserts the Word ῥήματι, a Word, and omits ζήσεται, he shall live, although the *Greek* Version reads it with the *Hebrew*. There again in the 10th Verse, *Christ* useth the Word προσκυνήσεις, thou shalt worship, where the *Greek* Version, *Deut. vi. 13. and x. 20.* hath it φοβηθήσῃ, thou shalt fear. Moreover, *ψ* 15, 16. Γῆ Ζαβουλὼν, ἡ γῆ

^r Cap. 3.^s Cap. 2. S. 3. p. 110, &c.

Νεφθαλείμ, ὁδὸν θαλάσσης, πέραν τῆ Ἰορδάνη, Γαλι-
 λαία τῶ ἐθνῶν· ὁ λαὸς ὁ καθήμενος ἐν σκότει, εἶδε φῶς
 μέγα· ἔ τ τοῖς καθημένοις ἐν χώρᾳ ἢ σκιά θανάτου, φῶς
 ἀνέτειλεν αὐτοῖς· *The Land of Zabulon, and the*
Land of Nephtalim, by the way of the Sea beyond
Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles: The People which
sat in Darknes saw great Light, and to them which
sat in the Region and Shadow of Death, Light is
sprung up, which Isa. ix. 1, 2. are thus expressed
by the Septuagint, Χώρα Ζαβουλών, ἡ γῆ νεφθαλείμ,
ἢ οἱ λοιποὶ οἱ τῆ Γαλιαν, ἢ πέραν τῆ Ἰορδάνη, Γαλι-
λαία τῶ ἐθνῶν, ὁ λαὸς ὁ πορεύμενος ἐν σκότει, ἰδεε φῶς
μέγα· οἱ κατοικῶντες ἐν χώρᾳ σκία θανάτου, φῶς λάμ-
ψει ἐφ' ὑμᾶς· The Land of Zebulun, or the Land of
Naphtali, and the rest by the Sea, and beyond Jor-
dan, Galilee of the Gentiles, ye People who walk in
Darknes, behold a great Light: Ye who dwell in the
Region which is the Shadow of Death, Light shall
shine upon you; where in the first of the two Verses
 דַּרַּח הַיָּם *Darach Hajam, is rightly translated in the*
New Testament ὁδὸν θαλάσσης, the Way of the Sea,
but the Greek Version plainly omits it: In the lat-
ter Version, again St. Matthew abides by the Ori-
ginal, when he renders the last Word Γναβηβ
Gnalebem, αὐτοῖς, to them, not following the Septuagint
Version, ἐφ' ὑμᾶς, upon you. What we read in St.
Matth. ix. 13. and xii. 7. ἔλεον θέλω, ἢ ἔ θυσίαν,
I will have Mercy, and not Sacrifice, agrees more
exactly with the Original, Hof. vi. 6. יְהַסֵּךְ יִסֵּךְ
 חַסֵּךְ חַסֵּךְ *than with the Greek Version, which pas-*
sing by the negative Particle, hath it ἔλεος θέλω,
ἢ θυσίαν, I will have Mercy, rather than Sacrifice.
 Ἄρα, *Mat. xi. 10. Ἴδὲ, ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὸ ἄγγελόν μου*
πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὅς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδὸν σου τὴν ἔμπροσθέν σου·
Behold, I send my Messenger before thy Face, who shall
prepare thy way before thee. Here the Hebrew is pro-
perly render'd, but it cannot be taken from the Greek
Translation, where it is read thus: Ἴδὲ ἐξαποστέλλω
 τὸν

τὸν ἄγγελόν μου, ἃ ἐπελέψεται ὁδὸν πρὸ προσώπου μου,
Behold, I send my Messenger, and he shall look upon the way before me; for פִּנָּח *Pinah*, in *Piel*, is rightly translated κατασκευάζειν, *to prepare*, but it is incongruously turn'd ἐπελέπειν, *to look upon*. In *Matth.* xi. 29. the Words of Christ, ἃ εὐρήσετε ἀνάπαυσιν ὑψυχῶν, *and ye shall find Rest to your Souls*, follow the *Hebrew* Original of *Jerem.* vi. 16. where the *Hebrew* Word מָגַר *Margang*, signifies *Rest*, from the Root גָּרַר *Ragang*, which in *Niphal* and *Hipbel* import *he rested, he gave Rest*; but by no means do they agree with the *Septuagint*, which hath it ἀγνισμὸν, *Purification*. As also *St. Matthew's* Translation, *Chap.* xii. 18. ἴδὲ ὁ παῖς μου, ὃν ἡρέτισα ὁ ἀγαπητός μου, εἰς ὃν ἐδόκησεν ἡ ψυχὴ μου, *Behold my Servant whom I have chosen; my beloved, in whom my Soul delighteth*, comes nearer to the Text, *Isa.* xlii. i. than to the Version of the *LXX* Elders, which runs thus: Ἰακώβ ὁ παῖς μου ἀνιλήφομαι αὐτόν. Ἰσραὴλ ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου, προσεδέξατο αὐτόν ἡ ψυχὴ μου, *Jacob my Servant I will help him: Israel mine Elect, my Soul hath received him*. This differs from the Original, both in Words and Sense, and wrongfully applies to the People of *Israel* the Prophecy of *Isaiah* about the *Messiah*. In like Manner *St. James*, in determining the Time of the Drought, differs both from the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Text: And whereas the *LXX* have 1 *Kings* xviii. 1. ἐν τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ τῷ τρίτῳ, *in the third Year*, *St. James* sets it down, ἐνιαυτὸς τρεῖς ἢ μῆνας ἕξ, *three Years and six Months*. We could produce many such Examples, especially out of *St. Matthew*; so that I cannot but admire with what Face he could so banter his Reader, appealing to a Comparison of Places; which indeed plainly refutes and convicts of Untruth the Falsifier's Assertion, that *St. Matthew* and *St. James* always agree with the *Greek* Copy.

As

As to the *seventh*, it is as false as the rest, since all the Places of the New Testament, which render the *Hebrew* Text, and depart from the *Septuagint*, plainly shew that they came from the *Hebrew* Original, not from the *Greek* Version. Beside those we have already cited, consult *Luke* iii. 4. compared with *Isa.* xl. 3. — *Luke* iv. 18. compared with *Isa.* lxi. 1. *Luke* xix. 46. compared with *Isa.* lvi. 7. and *Jerem.* vii. 11. — *Luke* xxii. 37. compared with *Isa.* liii. last Verse, — *Acts* iii. 22. and vii. 37. compared with *Deut.* xviii. 15. — *Acts* vii. 49. compared with *Isa.* lxvi. 1. — *Acts* viii. 32. compared with *Isa.* liii. 7. — *Rom.* iii. 10. compared with *Psal.* xiv. 3. — *1 Cor.* xv. 54. compared with *Isa.* xxv. 8, &c. not to speak of innumerable other Texts which might be produced; provided it be observed, that every Text must not therefore be denied to be taken out of the *Hebrew* Copy, only because it does not run precisely in the same Words as in the Original. Otherwise by the same Argument you might prove, that the same Citations are not taken from the *Greek*, as Mr. *Whiston* falsely alledges, because very few Texts are cited in the same Tenour and Order of Words in the New Testament, in which they are read in the *Septuagint* Version.

As to the *eighth*, the Testimony of the *Fathers* who were distant from the Age of the Apostles a whole Century and more, is of no great Value here, where a bare Inspection represents the whole Case to the Eye, and ends the Dispute. Besides, very few of the *Fathers* understood *Hebrew*, and therefore cannot be thought competent Judges of this Controversy.

To the *ninth*, this again is proved to be false from *Acts* i. 20. compared with *Psal.* lxxix. 25. — *Acts* ii. 31. compared with *Psal.* xvi. 10. and other Places, in which the Writers of the New Testament,

ment, leaving the *Greek* Psalter, give us another and quite different Form of Words.

To the *tenth*, it is sufficient to retort, that is a mere *Hypothesis* of Mr. *Whiston's*, is confuted by ocular Inspection of the Copies, and was invented by him only for a Pretence that he might charge the original Text of the Old Testament with Corruption: Which Invention of his throughout this whole Work we make it our Business to confute; and so there is no Reason why we should upon the Account thereof admit his false and altogether absurd Opinion.

CHAP. VIII.

Of Josephus, and his Scriptural Citations and Chronology.

To this refers

PROPOSITION IX. P. 184.

Josephus the famous Jewish Historian, Contemporary with the Apostles of our Saviour, always made use of the Hebrew Copies of the Old Testament, and not of the Septuagint Version in his Antiquities.

The Arguments follow.

“ i. **H**IS first Argument is drawn from the Circumstances of the Author, whose Duty
 “ it was to Officiate in his Turn in the Temple.
 “ *Josephus* was not only a *Jew* but a Priest, of
 “ the Family of the Priests; he was brought up
 “ from

“ from his Childhood in the *Hebrew* Law, in
 “ the *Hebrew*, and a Dialect of it the *Chaldee*
 “ Language, and in the *Hebrew* Learning: He
 “ wrote, as he himself assures us, the History of
 “ the *Jewish* War in the *Chaldee* Language, for
 “ the Use of the Eastern *Jews* in *Babylon*, before
 “ he wrote it in *Greek* for the Use of the We-
 “ stern *Greeks* and *Romans*: So that he must more
 “ easily and naturally make use of the *Hebrew*,
 “ than of the *Greek* Bible. And since the *He-*
 “ *brew* was the Original, it would be more au-
 “ thentick and more masterly, in so curious and
 “ learned a Person as *Josephus* was, to have im-
 “ mediate Recourse to the *Hebrew* Original, than
 “ to trust merely to any Translation whatsoever,
 “ ver, &c.

Secondly, “ If we carefully compare *Josephus*’s
 “ Antiquities with the original *Hebrew*, and with
 “ the *Septuagint* Version, we shall easily discover,
 “ that *Josephus* directly and singly followed the
 “ *Hebrew* and not the *Greek* Text, even in such
 “ Places where there is no Suspicion of Corrup-
 “ tion on either Side. Thus to give Examples
 “ in the Beginning of the *Pentateuch*, and of his
 “ Antiquities, the *Hebrew* says, *God in the Begin-*
 “ *ning created the Heavens and the Earth*: The
 “ *Greek* says, *he made them*. *Josephus* agrees with
 “ the *Hebrew*. Thus the *Hebrew* says, *God breath-*
 “ *ed into Man the Breath of Lives*, in the Plural;
 “ but the *Greek*, *the Breath of Life*, in the Sin-
 “ gular. *Josephus* here so certainly follows the
 “ *Hebrew*, that he says here, that *God inserted*
 “ *into the Body of Man both a Soul and a Spirit*;
 “ which was the Notion of the consistent Parts
 “ of Mankind in his Days; for which Conclusion
 “ the *Greek* gives no Handle at all. Thus *Jose-*
 “ *phus* still interprets the *Hebrew* Words, *Adam*,
 “ *Issa*, *Eva*, *Phison*, *Geon*, *Diglath*, *Euphrates*,
 “ *Sabbath*,

“ *Sabbath*, and innumerable others in *Greek*; as
 “ was necessary when he transcribed or translated
 “ Names of the *Hebrew*, many of which yet no
 “ where appear in the *Greek* Version. Nay, in
 “ giving the *Hebrew* Names themselves in *Greek*,
 “ he did no way confine himself to the Pronun-
 “ ciation of the *Septuagint*, but frequently used
 “ his own Judgment in expressing them. In short,
 “ he so evidently appears to follow the *Hebrew*
 “ all along, that in comparing some of his Books
 “ with that Version, I could very rarely find five
 “ or six *Greek* Words so put together, that one
 “ could suspect they were taken out of it; but
 “ all still appear’d as his own natural Expression
 “ of what he found in the *Hebrew*. In truth *Jose-*
 “ *phus*’s Agreement with the *Greek* Version in
 “ Language, is here so very inconsiderable, that
 “ I venture to say, if he had not himself given
 “ us a particular Account of the *Greek* Version of
 “ the *Pentateuch*, as it has been already set down
 “ at large, it would have been very hard to have
 “ proved by this Comparison, that he had ever
 “ seen even that most undoubted Version of the
 “ *Septuagint* Interpreters themselves. Nor does
 “ it yet appear that I know of, by any of *Jose-*
 “ *phus*’s Works, that he ever saw more of that
 “ *Greek* Version than the *Pentateuch*, &c.

Thirdly, “ In the principal Text where I have
 “ observed, that *Josephus* quotes a considerable
 “ Portion of the Old Testament, almost *verba-*
 “ *tim*, only abridg’d, which is out of the Pro-
 “ phet *Nabum*, we plainly find that he did not
 “ follow the *Septuagint* Version, but made one
 “ of his own from the *Hebrew*. And from thence
 “ may be inferr’d, that *Josephus*’s *Hebrew* Copy was

* Antiquit. Lib. ix. c. 11.

“ considerably different from the present *Masorete* Copy.

“ *Fourthly*, “ There is also the directest and most
 “ positive Evidence for this *Proposition* that can
 “ be desired; even *Josephus*’s own full, clear and
 “ frequent Testimonies, that he ever made use
 “ of the *Hebrew* Original, and that with the
 “ greatest Care and Impartiality, without adding
 “ to, or detracting from any thing therein con-
 “ tain’d. Here he cites the full Testimonies of
 “ *Josephus*, as they are collected by the very
 “ learned “ *Dr. Hody*, wherein *Josephus* testifies,
 “ that he always closely followed the Original
 “ *Hebrew*.” *Mr. Whiston* * further adds, “ On-
 “ ly it well deserves our further Remark, that
 “ *Josephus*, when he wrote his *Antiquities*, seems
 “ not only to have had the Use of one or more
 “ ordinary *Hebrew* Copy, but probably of the
 “ most authentick Copy in the whole Nation,
 “ namely, that which had been laid up in the Tem-
 “ ple itself: which very Book seems to have
 “ been given him, or however the use of it free-
 “ ly allowed him, after the Destruction of the
 “ Temple, and when he wrote his *Antiquities*.
 “ Then he gives another long Citation out of
 “ *Josephus*, &c. And he adds, that the very
 “ most authentick Copy of all, which used to be
 “ laid up in the Temple at *Jerusalem*, might
 “ probably be put there, upon the Dedication of
 “ the Temple, after the Profanation of it by
 “ *Antiochus Epiphanes*, 234 Years before the De-
 “ struction of *Jerusalem* by *Titus*: Which Things
 “ deserve our particular Observation.

ii. *ANSW.* Whatever there may be in all this, it is not so much advanced by *Mr. Whiston* in Defence of *Josephus*, as to cast a Reproach upon the

! v De LXX. part. 1. Lib. 3. C. 1. S. 2. p. 223, 224.

* p. 193.

v De vita sua, p. 1030, 1031.

Hebrew Bible. For if it once be allowed, that *Josephus* exactly follow'd the Reading of his own *Hebrew Copy*, he will with great Ease make it appear next, that the present *Hebrew Copy* is very widely different from the old one, and has suffer'd notable Corruptions: Because *Josephus's* Reading and History, and also his Computation and Chronology of Times, notoriously differ from the *Hebrew Text*. But *Josephus* hath long since, so far lost all Credit in his Accounts of Things taken from the holy Scripture, that learned Men with great Eagerness, and with as great Unanimity reject his Authority. "Some blame *Josephus* for the grievous and intolerable Liberty he takes in romancing; others for his Negligence, others for his Fraud and Flattery: And it is none of the slightest Complaints which those make who bitterly exclaim against him, for appearing to lessen the Miracles of *Moses* and Others." Thus ^a *Carolus Daubuz* declares, not according to his own Persuasion, but according to the Truth of the Matter in Fact. So also ^a *Petrus Cuncæus*, who otherwise is very profuse in his Commendations of *Josephus*, yet in his *Book de Republ. Hebr.* he upbraideth him with Rashness and Carelessness, and is at no small Pains in refuting him. The great ^b *Bochart* says, "This relies only upon the Testimony of *Josephus*, who often imposeth upon his Reader, as may be inferred from this particular History, which is of suspected Credit in many Things." And again, ^c "so many Errors of *Josephus* in so few Words shew, that we are not hastily to give Credit to that Writer, when he is treating of

^a Pro Testimonio Fl. Josephi de Christo Lib. i. part. 2.

S. 5.

^a Lib. ii. Cap. i.

^b In Phaleg. Lib. ii.

Cap. 26. p. 154.

^c Sub finem Capituli.

“ foreign Affairs.” ^d *Job. Selden*, speaking of *Josephus*, after reproving his Vanity, says: “ But in his Account which he gives of the sacred Laws, he has several other Things widely different, both from the *Hebrew Text*, and the *Talmudick Doctrine*.” And as to his Errors, consult chiefly ^e *Antonius Possevinus*, and ^f *Jacobus Salianus*, who have made a faithful Collection of them. ^g *Andr. Rivetus* says, “ Here *Josephus* adds many Things to the scriptural Narrative, yea some Things, which agree but ill with it, and which lessen the Credit of other Parts. Therefore in such Places he ought to be read with Caution, lest he impose upon an unwary Reader. For tho’ he is a diligent Historian in the main, yet writing the Antiquities of his own Nation with a Design to communicate them to Foreigners, he describ’d what concern’d his own Country as pompously as he could; and where he thought that the Simplicity of the Scripture did not sufficiently set off to Advantage the *Jewish Affairs*, he made no Scruple of inventing and adding many Things out of his own Head: Though he might indeed take some from other Authors, who had written before him, or might insert them in his History from some Tradition which he had received: And this Caution we think fit to give once for all, that Students may read so considerable an Author with Judgment, distinguishing Certainties from Uncertainties, and taking special Care to adhere to the sacred History.” Which deliberate Judgment, of one of the chief and old Divines among the Reformed, is not without Foundation, but is indeed of great Weight.

^d Lib. ii. de Synedrjis Ebræor. cap. vi. p. 166.

apparatu sacro.

^f In Annalibus sacris.

ment in Exod. ii. 5, &c. T. i. opp. f. 747. a. b.

^e In

^g Com-

“ *Gulielm.*

Gulielm. Saldenus, copying after him, says, that *Josephus*, however famous, yet in many Things ^h is an Author to be very little trusted. And of our Communion, the very learned ⁱ *Job. Ludolphus*, calls *Josephus*, oftener a Teller of Tales, with Respect to the Jewish Antiquities, than a true Historian. Yea, of the *Papists* also, ^k *Rich. Simonius*, though he does not defraud *Josephus* of his due Praise, yet he could not disown but that he was far from exact, and that after he had promised to give us nothing but the plain, simple, and undisguis'd Sense of Scripture, yet he very often differs vastly from it, mixes Glosses of his own with it, leaves out what he pleases, and accommodates the Text to his own Fancies; in short, prefers his own Conceits to the Word of God himself. Afterwards, he accuses him of want of due Care, in compiling his History, where Affairs should have been reported, as faithfully set down in the authentick Copies: That he plainly follows the Sense of his own Mind more than the Scripture Text, and that he shews very little of a scrupulous Writer.

But lest any one should complain that *Josephus*, before either hearing or pleading, is cried down and condemn'd, upon the Authority only and suffrage of partial Witnesses; let him consult (besides *Salianus* and *Possevinus* cited by *Selden*) ^l *Cæsar Baronius*, who studiously and frequently discovers and lays open his Failures in Point of Fidelity; and also our *Thom. Ittigius*, who hath collected into one View many of *Josephus's* Mistakes in ancient History, contrary to the Authority of the Scripture: See his very learned *Prolegomena*, prefixed to the Edition of *Josephus's*

^h Lib. i. Otior. Theol. Exerc. 1. S. 10. p. 9. ⁱ Commentario in hist. Æthiop. 230. ^k Hist. Crit. V. T. Lib. i. cap. 17. ^l In Annalibus Ecclesiasticis.

Works at *Leipsick*, An. 1691. and inserted at the End of the latest Edition of *Josephus*, which was publish'd under the Care and Inspection of the famous *Sigebertus Havercampius* in *Holland*, An. 1726, pag. 78. And finally, he may read the very learned *Dane, Petrus Brinch*, who in his *Examination of the Chronology and History of Fl. Josephus* (which is inserted intire in the said last Edition of the Works of ^m *Josephus*) fills up the whole second Part with the Errors of the *Jewish* Historian, where he either contradicts, detracts from, or adds to the holy Scripture. He observes ⁿ also, " That *Josephus* in writing the *Jewish* Antiquities in *Greek*, did not only make use of the sacred *Hebrew* Copy, but likewise of other Writers of his own Nation, and moreover, sometimes follow'd his own Invention and Fancy, too much affecting an eloquent and lofty Style: And hence it is, that either in the Way of History or Comment, he hath said many more Things than are mention'd in the *Hebrew* Bible, yea some Things directly contrary." Therefore the Encomiums of *Scaliger, Casaubon, Rich. Mountague*, and other famous Men, collected and exhibited by *Havercampius*, in the Beginning of the Edition of *Josephus*, to support the Author's Credit, I should chuse to understand of those Times only wherein he himself liv'd, or to the Things which he had taken from Records of fresh Date: And this ^o he himself testifies, ἐγὼ δ', ἢ καὶ περὶ τῆς πολέμου παντός, καὶ περὶ τῆς ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ μέγας γνομήων, ἀληθῆ καὶ ἀναγραφῶν ἐποιήσαμιν, τοῖς πραγμάτων αὐτὸς ἅπασιν παρατυχόν. But I have written agreeably to Truth, about the whole War, and the particular Transactions of it, having been present myself in all

^m P. ult. p. 290, &c.

• Lib. i. contra Apion. cap. 9.

ⁿ In præfatione S. 3.

hose Affairs. But the Case is vastly different as to his *Book of Antiquities*, and his ancient History of those Things which he could learn only from the holy Scripture, in which he often runs wide of Truth, as appears by comparing the Old Testament with his Books. In this way, as I conceive, the differing Judgments of learned Men, both against and in Favour of *Josephus*, may be adjusted and reconciled. But here our Debate with Mr. *Whiston* is about Matters of ancient Date related one way in the *Hebrew Copy*, and otherwise by *Josephus*, in which the learned with one Consent reject his Authority.

iii. That we may prove this by one or two Examples, we observe, *First*, That *Josephus* discovers either his Disregard to, or Ignorance of the *Hebrew Language*, ^p when upon *Exod. xvi. 15.* he weakly confounds the Particle *מן* Man, with *מה* Mah, thus commenting upon it, τὸ γὰρ μὲν ἐπερω-
τησις *ἤ* ἡμετέραν ἀφελκλον, τί τὰτ' ἐστὶ ἀνακείνυσσα,
For Man, according to our Language, is a Particle of Interrogation, when we ask what is this. But ^q *Cartwright* an *Englishman*, and ^r *Servat: Gallæus*, inform us better about the Origine and Notation of that Word, whom the Reader may please to turn to. So *Potiphar*, *Joseph's* Master, whom *Moses* calls *שר הטבחים* Saar Hatabachem, the Captain of the Guards, *Gen. xxxvii. 36.* our Author ^s makes ἀρχιμάγειρον, chief Cook, who *ἐπὶ τῇ Φαραώδε μαγειρῶν* τῷ βασιλέως, was set over King *Pharaoh's* Cooks. But altho' *טבח* Tabach, signifies a Cook, *1 Sam. ix. 23, 24.* and *טבחור* Tabachot, Women Cooks, *1 Sam. viii. 13.* yet this *Potiphar* is expressly called the chief Captain of the Guards, *אל בית הסוד* over the Prison, *Gen. xl. 3.* And how absurdly this

^p Lib. iii. Antiqu. C. i. n. 6.

^q Ad Citat. Loc.

Exod.

^r Ad oracula Sibyll. T. i. p. 295, &c.

^s Libi ii. Antiqu. Cap. 4.

must be wrested and misapply'd to the chief Cook, every Body sees: Not to mention that in *Jer.* xxxix. 9. *Nebuzaradan* is called רב טבח *Rab Tabachem*, Captain of the Guards, and not of the Cooks. Also when ¹ he had rendred the Word רב רובל, τῷ ἰωβήλ, he adds; ἐλθεῖαν ᾧ σημαίνει τὸνομα, which Word signifies Liberty: Moreover, ² he explains the Word גלגל Galgal, γάλα-γαλα, σημαίνει ᾧ τὸ πλεονέκτιον ὄνομα, which Name denotes Liberty. Again, the Stone which the Hebrew Text calls רבן אבן *Aben Haezar*, *Josephus* ³ renders ἰσχυρόν, strong, robust, σύμβολον τῷ πατρὶ τῷ θεῷ ἡρωμῆος αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῷ ἐχθρῶν ἰαύθ. As a Symbol of the Strength, wherewith God had endowed them for defeating their Enemies: I am afraid, that in these Instances, he can scarce make good his Skill in the Hebrew.

Secondly, Besides we observe, that not regarding the Sacredness of the Law, he perverts the Sense of *Moses*; when to the Laws promulgated by *Moses* ⁴, he adds these: βλασφημεῖτω ᾧ μηδεὶς θεὸς, ὅς ποτε ἄλλαι νομίζουσι. μὴ σιλήν ἱερὰ ξενικά, μηδ' ἂν ἐπωνομασμένον ἢ τινι θεῷ χειμήλιον λαμβάνειν, let no body blaspheme the Gods, which other Cities esteem to be such. Rife not the sacred Things of Strangers, and take not away a Gift dedicated to any God: Which Things are no where to be found in *Moses*, but you will perceive that they are entirely contrary to Scripture, if you compare them with *Exod.* xxiii. 24. *Deut.* xii. 2, 3. *Jer.* x. 11. and you may very reasonably conclude, that he contriv'd them on purpose to flatter the Romans, whom he saw enslav'd and wholly given up to the Worship of Idols.

Thirdly, He adds many Things to the sacred

¹ Antiqu. Lib. iii. cap. 12. n. iii.

² Lib. v. c. i. n. 11.

³ Lib. vi. cap. 2. sub fin.

⁴ Lib. iv. Antiqu. cap. 8. n. 10.

Text, either from *Jewish* Traditions and Fables, or out of his own Imagination, and to display his Eloquence: For Example, when *Moses* Gen. xii. 10, &c. says, that *Abraham* went down into *Egypt*, upon Account of Famine only, ² *Josephus* adds, that the *Patriarch* went thither, “ Both “ that he might enjoy their Plenty, and might “ learn the Opinion of the Priests about their “ Gods: If their Religion was better, to be their “ Convert; or if his was the truer, to convert “ them.” Which is an injurious Reflection upon the *Friend of God*: And ² finally, he adds, how that *Abraham*, having convers’d with the *Egyptians*, after his Wife was restor’d to him, taught them Arithmetick and Astrology, to both which Sciences the *Egyptians* had been hitherto Strangers, &c. In like Manner *Josephus* ^b augments with a long Train of Fables, the Account given about the Birth of *Moses*, Exod. ii. Moreover, what Things are related ² *Cbron.* xxvi. 19, 20. by way of plain Narrative about King *Uzziah*’s being struck with Leprosy, ^c *Josephus*, most marvellously sets off; “ that the Earth “ trembled with a terrible Commotion, and the “ Temple being rent, the glaring Light of the “ Sun shone out, and darted itself upon the “ King’s Face, and then he was immediately “ seiz’d with Leprosy. And before the City, at “ a Place called *Eroge*, the half of the Mountain being broken off, where it looks towards “ the West, and rolling along for the Space of “ four Furlongs, it stopt towards the Eastside “ of the Hill, and shut up the Highways, and “ the Kings Gardens, &c.” Now the Scripture mentions none of these Things, except the Le-

^a Lib. iv. Antiqu. cap. 8.

^b Toto, n. 2.

^c An-

tiqu. Lib. ii. c. 5.

^e Lib. ix. cap. 10. n. 4.

profy. ^d Of the same Kind are the Letters of Solomon to Hiram, and ^e Hiram's Answer to them, and several Orations formed according to *Josephus's* Fancy. He likewise alters the Numbers, and what the Scripture 1 Sam. xviii. 25. calls an hundred, and in *ſ* 27. two hundred Foreskins, *Josephus* extends to six hundred Lives of their Enemies. He hath innumerable other Instances of this Kind. ^f Whatever therefore he may protest concerning the Truth of his History, and however he may submit it to the Judgment of others, yet the Thing speaks itself, that he much oftener acted the Orator than the Historian, and that he was much more concern'd how to make his Narratives agreeable, than how to suit them to holy Scripture.

Fourthly, It is also plain, that he passes over in Silence, and conceals many Things which were material to be inserted in the History: For ^g Example, he speaks not one Word of Circumcision received by the *Shechemites*, but he gives this Turn to the Slaughter of them, "That in the Time of some solemn Festival, as the *Shechemites* were wholly given up to Diversion and Luxury, *Simeon* and *Levi* in the Night attack'd their Out-Guards, and slew them as they were asleep, and afterwards entring the City, they killed all their Males, &c." ^h He passes over the whole History of the Golden Calf, which is fully described *Exod.* xxxii. no doubt by this his Silence, endeavouring to salve the Honour of his Forefathers. So likewise *Josephus* says nothing at all of the brazen Serpent, nor of the Calamity and Recovery of *Job*, with many other Things:

^d Lib. viii. c. 2. ^e Lib. ii. c. 4. n. 5. & cap. 5. n. 5. cap. xv. n. 5. c. xvi. n. 1. Lib. iii. c. 5. n. 3. Lib. vi. cap. 10. n. 2. ^f Lib. viii. cap. 2. n. 8. ^g Lib. i. cap. 21. n. 1. ^h Lib. iii. cap. 5. n. 7, 8.

which

which ⁱ *J. B. Ottius* hath considered in a particular Treatise.

Fifthly, He delivers Things altogether contrary and repugnant to Scripture, as may be easily shewn from the Instances before mention'd.

Sixthly, It appears that he speaks disrespectfully of the divine Miracles, and leaves the Reader to think as he pleases of them: ^k For Example, after giving an Account of the Passage of the *Israelites* through the Red Sea, he plays the Orator in a very sceptical Manner; that the dividing of the Sea was made, εἴτε καὶ βέλησιν Θεῶν, εἴτε κατ' αὐτόμα-
τον, *either by the Will of God, or by the Force of Nature*: which he illustrates by a foreign Example, when the *Pamphylian Sea* yielded to *Alexander the Great's Army*. And at length he concludes, οὐδὲ μὴ ἐν ταύταις, ὡς ἐκάστω δοκεῖ, ἀγαμχανέτω, *But let every Man judge of those Things as he pleases*. Indeed *Reland* here pleads the Cause of *Josephus*, and vindicates him from the Suspicion of a profane Intention, but in such a Manner, that I believe all Men will not assent to him. ^l But farther, *Josephus* having related the glorious Appearance of God upon Mount *Sinai*, and the Communications which he had with *Moses*, he subjoins: "And I would have
" the Readers judge of these Things, as every
" one has a mind; but it is necessary for me to
" record them as they are found written in the
" sacred Books." Thus also does he in the rest.

iv. And these Things, as the Importance of the Subject required, I thought fit to prosecute the more at large, lest either *Mr. Whiston's* Assertion of the great Ingenuity used by *Josephus*, in his Account of the divine Oracles, might impose upon any one; or *Josephus's* own Testimony, by which,

ⁱ T. 2. Edit. Belgicæ novissimæ. p. 305, &c.
Antiq. 16. n. 5.

^l Lib. iii. c. 5. n. 2.

^k Lib. ii.

as on several other Occasions ^m, so in one certain Place more especially he protests thus: " But let
 " no Man blame me, that I have related in my
 " Works all those Transactions as I find them in
 " ancient Books. For at the very Beginning of
 " this History I gave a proper Precaution against
 " such as should question or find Fault with any
 " thing related, by solemnly affirming that I
 " have only render'd the *Hebrew* Books into
 " *Greek*, *μὴτε προσθεῖς τι τοῖς παλαιῶν αὐτῶν ἱστορίων,*
 " *μὴτ' ἀφαιρῶν τι παλαιῶν,* promising neither to add
 " nor to detract any thing, in my Account of those Af-
 " fairs." Which Protestation, how contrary it is
 to Matter of Fact, and how easy to be confuted
 and baffled by remarkable Instances, is suffici-
 ently plain from what has been above delivered.
 Now let Mr. *Whiston* go and persuade the simple,
 that *Josephus* most religiously and accurately trans-
 lated the *Hebrew* Text in his Works, yet he will ne-
 ver be able to pass off the Sham upon the knowing
 Part of Mankind; but it will be very easy to un-
 ravel his weak Pretences. For,

First, As to the *Circumstances* of the Writer,
 they are overturn'd by the Scope and Intention,
 which he proposed to himself in Writing. For
 if we were to grant, that he had sufficient
 Skill in the *Hebrew*, and that he made use of the
Hebrew Text besides the *Greek*, in composing his
 Work; yet since he was writing to Strangers, and
 to those who he knew, would never compare his
 Antiquities with the *Hebrew* Books, and with this
 View that he might set off the Original, and Ex-
 ploits of his Nation, and thereby raise the Ad-
 miration of his Readers; and besides, being
 blinded with *Pharisaism*, and an unbelieving
 Heart, which kept him from attaining to the ge-

^m Lib. x. Antiq. cap. 10. sub fin.

nuine Sense of the divine Oracles, especially about the *Messiah*, and fetching his Materials from the prophane & fabulous Records of his own Nation, as well as from the sacred Writings; and lastly, taking upon him to refine upon the Simplicity of Expression, with Pomp of Words, and big-swalling Oratory: From hence may be plainly understood, that *Josephus* thought it no Crime to depart from the *Hebrew* Copy, as often as he judged it proper for his Purpose so to do.

Secondly, When he challenges us to collate, he must have harden'd his Forehead to a high Degree of Effrontery. For in the preceding Section we have compared the Book of Antiquities with the *Hebrew* Text, and have taken Notice of the vastly wide Disagreement between the one and the other, in so much that by this principal Argument one may overturn Mr. *Whiston's* whole Disputation. But it is very childish and unbecoming a Man of Gravity and Learning, to strain so hard for an Agreement in one or two Words, when it is overthrown and refuted by whole Sentences, omitted in one Place, redundant in others, and elsewhere variously enlarged. He also shews himself ignorant of the *Hebrew* Language, when he explains the Word חַיִּים *Chajem*, *Life*, Gen. ii. 7. under the Notion of Plurality; as of more Kinds of Lives than one, and upon that Pretence prefers the Paraphrase of *Josephus*, which explain'd it by πνεῦμα καὶ ψυχὴ, *Spirit and Life*, to the *Septuagint* Version, which translated it *Life*. For although that Word be of the Plural Number, yet its Signification is Singular, and denotes *Life*, not *Lives*; as is shewn by the *Concordances*, and after them by *Sanctes Pagninus*, *Gulielm. Robertson*, and others in their Lexicons. The Adjective חַיִּים *Chaii* in the Concrete, expresses one that is *alive*, or *living*; and oftentimes supplying the Place of a Verb, it is the same

same as *to be among the Living*, which Signification its Plural *חַיִּים Chayem* also maintains *Deut. iv. 4. Psal. cxxiv. 3. Eccles. vi. 8, &c.* But the abstract Noun *Life*, though not expressed by any other but the plural Termination *חַיִּים Chayem*, yet has a singular Signification, equivalent to which is the Noun *חַיַּת Chayut*, (*2 Sam. xx. 3.*) as the very School-boys know; so that in this Place we may judge, that *Josephus* has shewn himself an unhappy Paraphrast, since even the *Septuagint* Version hath come much nearer to the Original than he. Mr. *Whiston* does but trifle, when he declaims about the different Interpretation and Reading of proper Names in *Josephus*, as also about his Style, as differing much from the Manner of Expression used by the *Greek* Translation; for from thence you can conclude nothing.

Thirdly, As to that Place of *Nabum. ii. 9, &c.* our Adversary is either jesting with us, or raising Smoak to blind his Reader's Eyes. For the Recital of that Passage in *Josephus*, differs no less from the *Hebrew* than from the *Greek* Copy; so that indeed *Josephus* comes not so near the *Hebrew* Text, as the *Greek* Translation doth: And therefore what our Sophister means, I cannot comprehend. The Reader may try the Experiment, and may compare those three Columns together, and go away convinced of Mr. *Whiston's* Falsity. But granting Mr. *Whiston's* Demand, what then! *Josephus* hath followed the authentick Text nearer than the *Greek*, in this Prophecy (which however is false) what follows? For no one will deny that *Josephus* had the *Hebrew* Copy at hand, when he compiled his Work: But the Question is, whether he followed the *Hebrew* Copy only, and with such Exactness, that we may charge Corruption upon the *Hebrew* Text because of *Josephus*, and correct it by him? This is what

what he never will be able to make good from thence.

Fourthly and lastly, ⁿ We have demonstrated, that *Josephus's* Protestations are of no Moment, being convicted of Falsity throughout the whole Work, so that the comparing them with the Examples, rather sinks and destroys the Credit of the Writer of the *Antiquities*, than any thing else.

V. It remains that we enquire briefly after that *Hebrew* Copy, which, as Mr. *Whiston* says, *Josephus* made use of. From thence indeed you can draw no solid Conclusion to the Detriment of the modern Text, since the historical Accounts in the *Antiquities* of *Josephus*, might as far depart from that Copy which he then made use of, as from our modern ones: But yet the Thing deserves to be a little farther inquired into. For the Purpose, *Josephus* having had leave given him ^o by *Titus*, to take what ever he pleas'd out of the Ruins of his Country, says, that he valued nothing so much as Liberty for himself and Family, and the sacred Books, which he accepted as a Present from *Titus*. Again, ^p he makes mention, that the Copy of the Law, which they had taken from the Temple, or out of some Synagogue, was last in Order carried about in Triumph at *Rome*, after the golden Table and Candlestick; and ^q he relates, how that *Titus* commanded the same Copy, together with the purple Veils of their most holy Place, to be carefully repositied in the Temple of Peace. As then the former Place give us not the least Hint, that *Josephus* sought or took out of the Temple the sacred Books granted him by the Favour of *Titus*: So his latter Testimonies do directly con-

ⁿ L. præced. ^o Lib. de vita sua, cap. 75. ^p De bello Jud. Lib. vii. cap. 5. Edit. Belgicæ n. 5. p. 415.
^q n. 7. p. ead. &c.

tradict and deny it; one of which affirms, that the Copy of the Temple was afterwards made a Spectacle in the *Roman* Triumph, and the second Testimony says, that long after the Triumph was over, it was laid up among the Trophies of the Temple of Peace; and hence it is evident, that it could not be in the Possession or Hands of *Josephus*, when he compos'd his Books of *Antiquity*.

PROPOSITION X. Page 195.

The genuine Chronology of Josephus agreed, neither with the present Hebrew, nor with the present Greek; but almost always with that of the Samaritan Pentateuch.

i. **A**Lthough Mr. *Whiston* no way doubts, but that *Josephus* made an accurate Computation of Times, according to the *Hebrew* Copy which he used, yet he grants, that his Numbers as they now stand, have been very often confounded and corrupted, so that he neither altogether agrees with, nor can be well reconcil'd to himself every where, nor with the *Hebrew* Copy, or the *Septuagint* Version. Mr. *Whiston* therefore, makes it his whole Business, to search after and restore the ancient and primitive Chronology of *Josephus*; but in such a Manner as to demonstrate it to be widely different from the Chronology of our *Hebrew* Copy. For this End, he not only calls in other Writers to his Assistance, who make *Josephus's* Numbers different from those we at present read in his Books; (such as * *Euseb.* and * *Clemens Alexandrinus*, and from them and

* Lib. iii. Hist. Eccl. c. 10.

* Strom. i. p. 341.

from

from his own Conjectures, he so contrives his Calculations, as to bring them as near as possible to the *Samaritan Copy*) but afterwards in *Prop.* xi. p. 203, &c. he attempts also to fix and settle all the Periods of Times according to such Order and Ending, as he had proposed to himself; so as to make the Number of Years from the Creation of the World to the thirteenth Year of the Emperor *Domitian*, in which his Antiquities end, to be 4752.

ii. Though the discussing and refuting of all his Calculations would be a prolix and very tedious Work, yet I should not pass it over, if the Point to be examined had but the least Colour, either from the Testimony of good Authors, or any other weighty Reasons. But now, when I understand that I have to engage with Mr. *Whiston's* Conjectures, contrived only for this End, to persuade the World that the *Hebrew Copy* abounds with Errors, and that its genuine Reading is still preserved, as we read it in the *Samaritan Pentateuch*, I may very justly decline such laborious Trifling as that must be, to fight against Monsters and Spectres, conjured up from Mr. *Whiston's* own Brain. I shall think my Design sufficiently answer'd, by briefly explaining what deserves Notice in *Josephus's* Chronology, from whence a Judgment may be made of Mr. *Whiston's* whole System. The above-named *Petr. Brinch* hath comprized all that is needful to be said on this Head in few Words, when he says, "Verily there is so great Corruption and Disagreement in *Josephus's* Numbers, that it can scarce be discover'd what was the Opinion of *Josephus* about the Age of the World, and what

† In præfat. Examinis Chronologi Flav. Josephi.

“ Computation he has given of the Times of the
 “ Old Testament : for what he builds in one
 “ Place, he pulls down in another; and the
 “ particular Years are reckon’d up one way, and
 “ the Sum total in another.” And those Things
 he hath professedly and solidly demonstrated in
 that Treatise of his. As also ^u *Frid. Spanhemius* a
 good while ago, hath shewn it with great Accu-
 racy: And latest of all, the very learned * *Gott-
 frid. Koblreif* hath explain’d the same by way of
Synopsis. If you consult those two together,
 you will have every thing, which can appear any
 way to belong to *Josephus’s* Calculations, and the
 Corrections of them by *Vossius*. We shall very
 briefly shew, what we are to judge of this Mat-
 ter. Observing,

First, That the Calculations of *Josephus* differ
 not only from the *Hebrew* Copy, but likewise
 from the *Alexandrian Greek*, as also from the *Sa-
 maritan*, when the *Hebrew* Copy for the first *E-
 poch*, from the Creation of the World to the
 Flood, reckons up 1656 Years; the *Greek* Copy
 hath either 2242, or 2262, or 2256; the *Samaritan*
 1307, or 1327; finally *Josephus* 2256. For
 the second *Epoch*, from the Flood to *Abraham’s*
 going out from *Ur* of the *Chaldees*, the *Hebrew*
 Copy numbers 427; the *Greek* either 1172, or
 1072; the *Samaritan* 937, or 942; *Josephus* 1128.
 As to the third *Epoch*, from *Abraham*, to the *Is-
 raelites* marching out of *Egypt*, the *Hebrew* hath
 430 Years, *Exod.* xii. 30. *Gal.* iii. 17. *Josephus* just
 as many, in the sixth Chapter of his second Book
 of *Antiquities*; yet contradictory to himself in the
 fifth Chapter preceding. And thus in other Com-
 putations.

^u Chronol. Sacrae, p. 2. cap. 3. p. 151. opp. Tom. i.

* Chronol. Sacrae, cap. 4. p. 150.

Secondly,

Secondly, We observe, that *Josephus* is not consistent with himself, if the Sum of his Years be compared with the particular *Epochs* of which they are made up; when for Instance, in his *fifth Chapter*, numbers the Years of the Bondage of the *Israelites* in *Egypt*, after the Death of *Joseph*, τετρακοσίαις, *four hundred*, but in his following *sixth Chapter*, he says that the *Israelites* went out, in the two hundred and fifteenth Year after μετανάστασιν, *the Removal of Jacob into Egypt*. Moreover from the going out of the *Israelites*, to the laying the Foundation of *Solomon's Temple*, he computes 592 Years, against the sacred Copies, both *Hebrew* and *Greek*, and presently he overthrows the same Calculation, when he counts up from the Creation of the World to the Building of the Temple; ἔτη τετραχίλια ἡ ἑκατὸν, ἡ δύο, 3102 Years; which cannot be adjusted with the former Number, without offering Violence to the Text. Again from the Creation to the Destruction of the Temple, ² he reckons, ἔτη τετραχίλια πεντακόσια δεκαεῖα, μῆνας ἕξ, ἡμέρας δέκα, 3513 Years, *six Months, ten Days*. According to which the Temple stood from its Foundation, which was in the Year of the World 3102, only about 411 Years. But in the very same Place he says, that the Temple stood, ἀπὸ τῆς κατεσκευάσθαι, *from the time it was built*, compleat τετρακοσίαις ἡ ἑβδομήκοντα, 470 Years, with the Addition of six Months and ten Days: Which, and such like Contradictions, are more fully and clearly set forth by the above-named Authors.

Thirdly, Some of them are to be referr'd to *Josephus* himself, who so often confesseth, that he compiled his Work from various, not only sacred

¹ Lib. viii. cap. 2.

² Lib. x. cap. 2.

and publick, but also private Books, Schedules, and Commentaries of different Doctors of his own Nation, “ *Where* when he promiscuously writ down the Words of Authors, and did not always give due Attention to the Thing spoken of, he could not but bring out frequent Contradictions,” as ^a *Koblreif* rightly intimates. Add to this, that he admitted different Characters of Times, and not being able to pass a just Judgment upon them, confounded Truths with Untruths: As when he inserts the Succession of the High Priests into his Work ^b, and affirms, that it was continued for the Space of two thousand Years; and improperly applies to the sacred History, Synchronisms taken from profane History, a Catalogue of which ^c *Ezekiel Spanhem* hath given us. And again,

Fourthly, It is evident, that some of the Numbers are wrong, and it was owing to the Negligence, or Conceitedness and Rashness of Editors, which the above-named ^d *Koblreif* plainly demonstrates, by instancing in the first *Epoch* or Age of the World, shewing us, that instead of διχίλιον, *two thousand*, we ought to read it χίλιον, *a thousand*; as ^e *Guil. Bonjour* certifies us, that it is expressly read in an old Epitome of *Josephus*, kept in the *Vatican Library*; so that instead of 2656, the Sum will be 1656, which is the very Number fixed in Holy Scriptures.

Fifthly, From hence no body can be certain, either what the Numbers of *Josephus* were at first, or whose Calculations he followed, since without doing Violence to the Words, it cannot be de-

^a P. 156. ^b Lib. xx. c. 9. ^c P. ult. opp. *Josephi*
Edit. Belgicæ, f. 408, &c. ^d P. 151, &c. ^e Diss. Sel.
3. Dial. 3.

monstrated,

monstrated, that he approved of any Copy whatsoever. So that it is in vain to pretend with *Vossius*, *Paul Pezron*, and *Edward Bernard*, to adjust *Josephus's* Chronology to the Greek Copy of the *Septuagint*; or with *Mr. Whiston*, to endeavour to reconcile it with the *Samaritan* Copy, every one taking a different Way, and misemploying his Talents, and at length doing nothing.

Sixthly, Much more ought we to explode those prophane Men, who by this Engine presume to beat down the Authority of the *Hebrew* Text, and from the faulty Numbers of *Josephus*, charge Corruption upon the *Hebrew* Chronology, and are bold enough to adjust it to *Josephus*, as corrected by themselves upon their own Conjecture. Should any Man attempt the like even upon a prophane Author, he would not escape the Lash of the Learned; so far is it from deserving Admiration or Applause, to attempt such a thing in the divine and uncorrupted Records of the Holy Scriptures.

CHAP. IX.

Of the pretended Corruption designedly brought into the Hebrew and Greek Copies by the Jews.

PROPOSITION XII. P. 220.

The Jews, about the Beginning of the second Century of the Gospel, greatly altered and corrupted their Hebrew and Greek Copies of the Old Testament; and that in many Places, on purpose, out of Opposition to Christianity.

This Conceit he pretends to prove,

I. **F**IRST, "Because it would not be disagreeable to the received Doctrine and Customs of the Jews. For altho' in the Age of *Josephus*, they durst not make any Alteration in the sacred Books, yet afterwards they acknowledge in the *Talmud*, that it is not unlawful to make Alterations, and to correct Places in them; provided they think them for the Honour of God, and of Religion. And by consequence they may justly, and upon their own Principles, be suspected of having so done in the present Case: For making this good, he appeals to Places of the ^f*Talmud*, cited by ^g*Pezron*, and ^h*Walton*.

^f Ex Tract. *Jebammoth* & *Meghilla*. ^g *Antiq. Tempor. Resit.* p. 2. cap. 6. p. 420, &c. ^h *Prolegom. Bibl.* 7, S. 8.

Secondly,

Secondly, " The Obstinacy of the *Jews* and
 " their Vehemency against *Christ* and his Reli-
 " gion, affords still farther Ground for Suspicion
 " in this Case. For Proof of this, he quotes
 " Places from ⁱ *Irenæus*, ^k *Justin Martyr*, and
 " ^l *Jerom*.

Thirdly, " The *Jews* were reduc'd to so great
 " straits in their Disputes with the *Christians*,
 " while the *Septuagint* Version was every where
 " allowed to be agreeable to the original *He-*
 " *brew*; and the New Testament Citations all
 " genuine and to the Purpose; as was the Case in
 " the first Century: The Profelytes also, which
 " the *Christian* Religion made during that Time,
 " were so many, that the unbelieving and obsti-
 " nate Part of that Nation perceiv'd, that *all the*
 " *World*, even of their own Nation, *would* at this
 " rate *go after him*: They had therefore no other
 " possible way of stopping the farther Progress of
 " the Gospel among them, in their own Power,
 " but this of altering and corrupting their own
 " Copies, which were, as one may say, all the
 " Copies, excepting the *Samaritan Pentateuch*,
 " of the original *Hebrew*; and thence of altering
 " and corrupting their own Copies of the *He-*
 " *brew*, and of the *Septuagint* Version also, in such
 " Citations, and in such other Places, as might
 " suit their own Designs. And that they might
 " the more easily do, since the *Christians* did not
 " then know the *Hebrew* Language; and when
 " once that Corruption was brought in, the *Jews*
 " might object as to many of the Scripture
 " Texts, usually cited by *Christians* against them,
 " that they were different in the Original, &c.

Fourthly, " ^m It hath been already demonstra-

ⁱ 3. 24. p. 253.
 235.

^l In. Is. v. 18.

^k Dialog. cum Trypho. p. 234.

^m Prop. ii. prius.

" ted, that the *Hebrew* Copies in the Days of
 " *Christ* and his Apostles, and of *Josephus* the
 " *Jew*, or during the first Century, agreed with
 " the *Septuagint* Version of that Age; and that
 " they were not a little different from the *He-*
 " *brew* Copies, which *Aquila* and *Theodotion* tran-
 " slated, before the middle of the second Cen-
 " tury, &c. It is withal certain, that the change
 " was made in so short a Time, between the Days
 " of *Josephus* and *Aquila*, which was less than half
 " a Century, as renders it morally impossible,
 " that so many and so great Alterations, should
 " arise from any other Cause than a voluntary
 " Corruption.

" Fifthly, " That this Alteration of the Scripture
 " was voluntary, appears farther, by the chro-
 " nological Mutations in particular, made chiefly
 " in the *Pentateuch*, where the greatest Part of
 " the Scripture Chronology is contain'd. Now
 " these chronological Mutations must have been
 " voluntary. *First*, because among the very ma-
 " ny Numbers that are in that *Pentateuch*, equal-
 " ly liable to an involuntary Change, hardly any
 " are altered, but those on which the Series of
 " Chronology depends, &c. *Secondly*, Because
 " these Alterations are frequently made with such
 " Caution, and after so subtle a Manner, as most
 " evidently infers voluntary Contrivance and
 " Management. Thus the *Hebrew* has dropp'd
 " five hundred Years between the Flood and the
 " Birth of *Abraham*, which are in the *Samaritan*
 " in five several Generations, by diminishing the
 " Number 100 in each before the Birth of the
 " Son: Yet by adding as many Years severally
 " after the Birth of that Son, has it made up the
 " same whole Number of Years of the Life of
 " each Patriach; that this Corruption might not
 " appear too plainly, as the Table already set
 " down

“ down does shew. *Thirdly*, Because this whole
 “ Chronology seems particularly adjusted to the
 “ very Age when these Alterations were made,
 “ and when the *Jews* set up their spurious *Mes-*
 “ *siab Barcochab*, in the former Part of the se-
 “ cond Century; according to that famous
 “ *Jewish* Tradition, 2000 Years Emptiness, 2000
 “ Years the Law, and 2000 Years the Days of
 “ the *Messiah*; whom they took to be *Barcochab*,
 “ and to whose Time this Chronology particu-
 “ larly agrees; and who was the grand Perse-
 “ cutor of the *Christians*, and of them only, as
 “ *Justin Martyr*, a contemporary Writer as-
 “ sures us. For though we do not exactly know
 “ how the *Jews*, in the Beginning of the second
 “ Century, summ’d up the several Periods of the
 “ World from their *Hebrew* Numbers; yet do
 “ we know, by the exactest Calculation from the
 “ same *Hebrew* Copies now, if, with all the An-
 “ cients, we suppose *Abraham* born in the 70th
 “ Year of his Father *Terah*, that the entire 4000
 “ Years till the Days of the *Messiah*, will end a-
 “ bout *A. D.* 60. or about the very Time of
 “ the Birth of *Barcochab*. But after that *Barco-*
 “ *chab* had failed the *Jews* Expectation, the
 “ *Jewish* Chronologers endeavoured still to sup-
 “ port their Hopes of the true *Messiah*’s coming
 “ soon to them, by the cutting short the Chro-
 “ nology of the Kings of *Persia*; of which we
 “ hear not a Word before. For the *Seder Olam*
 “ *Rabba*, the *Jews* great *Chronicle*, written since
 “ the second Century, by which the *Jews* still
 “ compute the ancient Ages, gives but fifty-two
 “ Years to the *Persian* Monarchy: Which, we
 “ now know from *Ptolomy*’s Canon, was 204

“ *Talmud Babylon. Sanhedr. cap. Helec.* “ *Apol. r.*
 S. 38.

“ Years; and which *Josephus*, their own most
 “ ancient Historian, had before estimated at
 “ somewhat more. By this means they deferr’d
 “ the End of the 4000 Years for the coming of
 “ the *Messiah*, about a Century and a half lon-
 “ ger, which Period having also fail’d them, they
 “ do now accurse those that compute the Time
 “ for his coming: Though they do not deny
 “ their ancient Tradition that he was to come
 “ at the End of 4000 Years; which is mention’d
 “ in the *Babylonian Talmud* itself.

Sixthly, “ Many changes occur in those Places,
 “ which either concern the *Christian* Religion, or
 “ speak of the *Jewish* Nation and their Rulers.
 “ That Mr. *Whiston* may shew this by a notable
 “ Specimen of such Alteration, he appeals to
 “ *Matth.* i. 22, &c. where the Evangelist quotes
 “ a Prophecy of *Isaiah*, to prove, that the *Mes-*
 “ *siah* was to be born of a Virgin, which as it
 “ stands in all the late *Hebrew* and *Greek* Bibles,
 “ hath such a Clause subjoin’d, as seems no way
 “ applicable to the *Messiah*, and so occasions
 “ the *Jews* to triumph, as if that Prediction were
 “ meant not of a Virgin, but only of a young
 “ Woman in the Days of King *Abaz*. For what
 “ has the Birth of the *Messiah*, the true *Imma-*
 “ *nuel* of a Virgin, many hundred Years after-
 “ ward, to do with the Birth of another Child,
 “ before whose coming to Years of Discretion,
 “ *Rezin* King of *Syria*, and *Pekab* the Son of
 “ *Remaliab* King of *Israel*, were to leave the Land
 “ of *Judab* in the Days of King *Abaz*? Where
 “ Mr. *Whiston* makes a tedious trifling Ha-
 “ rangue about the 16th Verse of the vii Chapter
 “ of *Isaiah*, its not respecting the *Messiah*; but
 “ a younger Son of the Prophet, and that it
 “ ought to be put in between the 3^d and 4th
 “ Verses of the viii Chapter; that he may prove
 “ by

“ by this Example, that the Order was design-
 “ edly inverted by the *Jews*, for confounding
 “ the *Christians* about that notable Prophecy
 “ concerning the *Messiah*, which runs in a Co-
 “ herence through the 7th, 8th Chapters, and
 “ half of the 9th, and that different Prophecies
 “ have been blended together.

Seventhly, “ At the very Time when this Cor-
 “ ruption or Alteration was made, or rather
 “ was making amongst the *Jews*, *Justin Mar-*
 “ *tyr*, a learned and inquisitive *Christian*, disco-
 “ ver’d this Practice, charg’d it home upon the
 “ *Jewish Rabbins* and Rulers, and gave particular
 “ Examples of some Texts already dropt by
 “ them, &c. All which Things Mr. *Whiston*
 “ says, & he hath already shewn at large, &c.

Eighthly, “ This is confirm’d from the new
 “ Greek Versions of *Aquila*, *Theodotion* and *Sym-*
 “ *machus*, which were compos’d in the second
 “ Century for this very End, that the corrupt
 “ Copies of the Bible might be dispers’d through
 “ the World.

Ninthly, “ Those new Interpreters led by par-
 “ ty Prejudices, have differently translated sever-
 “ al Places; a plain Proof that the *Jews* de-
 “ signedly corrupted the *Hebrew* Books, which
 “ the *Christians* did not understand. For Example,
 “ when in the Place already cited, *Isaiab* useth
 “ the Word, *עלמה* *Alma*, which the LXX, and
 “ in Concurrence with them St. *Matthew*, have
 “ rightly translated *παρθένος*, a *Virgin*, yet *A-*
 “ *quila* and *Theodotion* have render’d it by a
 “ doubtful and uncertain Word *νεανίς*, a *young*
 “ *Woman*: As also, when in *Dan. ix. 26.* the *He-*
 “ *brew*, *Aquila* and *Theodotion* read, and after se-
 “ venty two Weeks the anointed [meaning the *Mes-*

“ *siab,*] *shall be cut off, &c.* *Theodotion* renders
 “ it thus : *καὶ μὲν τὰς ἑβδομάδας τὰς ἐξήκοντα δύο,*
 “ *ἐξολοθευθήσεται χεῖσμα, κ. τ. λ.* and after sixty
 “ *two Weeks, the Union shall be destroy'd.*

Tenthly, “ This voluntary Corruption of the
 “ Text of the Old Testament, and Solicitude
 “ for spreading this corrupted Text all over the
 “ World, appears very remarkably in those fa-
 “ mous *Targums*, or *Chaldee Paraphrases*, which
 “ appear to have been made by *Onkelos*, *Jonathan*
 “ and *Aquila*, for the Support of this new
 “ *Hebrew Text*, and securing its Reception over
 “ all the World, &c. That Mr. *Whiston* may clear
 “ up this Matter, he observes 1. That there is not
 “ the least good Evidence for any such writ-
 “ ten *Chaldee Paraphrases* as these, before the se-
 “ cond Century ; especially, since neither *Philo*
 “ nor *Josephus*, neither *Christ* nor his Apostles,
 “ nor any of the first *Christians*, ever quote
 “ them, or give the least Hint at them. He
 “ observes 2. That these *Paraphrases* cannot be
 “ so old as the first Century, because the only
 “ one which the *Jews* pretend to be of that
 “ standing must have been later ; namely, the
 “ *Targum* of *Jonathan* upon the Prophets. This
 “ Paraphrast who wrote upon all which the *Jews*
 “ call Prophets, and them only, that is, upon
 “ *Joshua*, *Judges*, *Samuel*, *Kings*, *Isaiah*, *Jeremi-*
 “ *ah*, *Ezekiel*, and the twelve minor Prophets,
 “ omits *Daniel*, and him only ; as though he
 “ were none of the Prophets, but only one of
 “ the *Hagiographers*, we may pretty certainly de-
 “ termine, that this *Paraphrase* was written after
 “ that Time. But the *Jews*, to the End of the first
 “ Century, reckon'd *Daniel* among the Prophets,
 “ therefore *Jonathan's Targum* was written after
 “ that Time, &c. 3. That yet the Style, No-
 “ tions, and internal Characters of these Tar-
 “ gums,

"gums, evidently shew, that they cannot be la-
 "ter than the second Century. He observes 4.
 "That yet the *Christians*, in the Western Parts
 "of the World, even *Origen*, and *Jerom* them-
 "selves, who understood *Hebrew*, and *Epipha-*
 "nus, who, as well as the others, frequently
 "convers'd with the then most learned *Jews* a-
 "bout all such Matters, never mention a Sylla-
 "ble of them in above four Centuries, as ha-
 "ving plainly never heard of any such Para-
 "phrases. From this he infers, that they were
 "not then read in the *Jewish* Synagogues in
 "the Western Parts of the World, as they since
 "have been: And that they were not even
 "known, or privately read by the learned *Jews*
 "there. 5. That what the *Jews* themselves say
 "of those Paraphraſts, implies, that they lived
 "and wrote in the former Part of the second
 "Century, and at no other Time. 9 For some-
 "times they say, that *Onkelos* and *Jonathan* the
 "*Chaldee* Paraphraſts, were the very same Per-
 "sons with *Aquila* and *Theodotion*, the *Greek*
 "Translators. At other Times they say, they
 "were their Friends and Contemporaries. From
 "this, and some other Things, which he
 "tells of these ancient Authors, he concludes,
 "That it is most probable, all these original Pa-
 "raphraſts, lived and wrote at the very same
 "Time, when *Aquila* and *Theodotion* made their
 "Greek Versions. He observes 6. That no o-
 "ther Account of the Occasion of these Para-
 "phrases, at this Time can be given, with the
 "least Probability, but this, viz. That as the
 "Greek Versions of *Aquila*, *Theodotion* and *Sym-*
 "machus, were made for the Use of the *Western*

9 Ibidem. Polyglot. Proleg. 12. de Targ. Hody de LXX.
 4. C. 1.

" *Jews*,

“ *Jews*, in the *Roman Empire*, where that Lan-
 “ guage was generally understood and used :
 “ So were these *Targums* or *Chaldee* Paraphrases
 “ made for the Use of the *Oriental* or *Babylonian*
 “ *Jews*, who knew the *Chaldee*, but not the
 “ *Greek Language*; and for whose Information,
 “ *Josephus* the *Jew*, had a little before written
 “ his History of the Wars of the *Jews*, in the
 “ same *Chaldee Language*, as we have formerly
 “ observ’d: And that they were made for the ve-
 “ ry same Purposes with those Versions, namely,
 “ to secure and recommend their New, and corre-
 “ cted, or corrupted Copies of the Old Testa-
 “ ment to their Brethren there; that they might
 “ all agree in the same Reading, and might be
 “ equally guarded against the former Copies, a-
 “ gainst the *Septuagint* Version, and against those
 “ Quotations according to it, which the *Chri-*
 “ *stians* had so long, and with so great Success,
 “ made use of against them. And this will be
 “ still farther confirm’d, if we observe 7. That
 “ no other Account but this can be given of the
 “ great Antiquity of the *Targums*, already al-
 “ low’d, consistently with that strange Circum-
 “ stance of their being generally unknown in
 “ these Western Parts, for four or five entire
 “ Centuries; which seems not less certain than
 “ the other: And this gives it to the greatest
 “ Satisfaction. For where should the new *Greek*
 “ Version be publish’d and used but in the *West*,
 “ where the *Greek* was understood, and not *Chal-*
 “ *dee*? And where should the new *Chaldee* Para-
 “ *phrases* be published and used but in the *East*,
 “ where *Chaldee* was understood, and not *Greek*?
 “ And this is the more confirm’d by another Ob-
 “ servation; that as soon as the *Jews*, about the
 “ fifth Century, grew weary of even their new
 “ *Greek* Versions, and oblig’d their People to
 “ learn

“ learn and use the original *Hebrew*, of which
 “ the *Chaldee* was little more than a Dialect,
 “ these ancient *Chaldee Paraphrases* came also in
 “ the *West*, and have ever since been used there
 “ by the *Western Jews*, as the greatest Autho-
 “ rity. He observes 8. That the Expressions
 “ concerning the divine λόγος, or *Word of God*,
 “ and the paraphrasing many Texts of the Old
 “ Testament, where God is said to appear, and
 “ act, of his appearing and acting by his *Mem-*
 “ *ra* or *divine Word*, exactly suits the former
 “ Part of the second Century; soon after *Philo*,
 “ and *St. John* had so clearly spoken of him in
 “ the same Manner; and when *Trypho the Jew*,
 “ and *Justin Martyr the Christian*, had so large-
 “ ly debated about him to the same Purpose.
 “ This Character shews, that these *Paraphrases*
 “ could not well be considerably later; as some
 “ of the former shew they could not well be con-
 “ siderably earlier than the Introduction of the
 “ modern Corruptions into the *Hebrew Text*, in
 “ the former Part of the second Century; and so
 “ give just Cause to suspect they were compos’d
 “ on Purpose to confirm and recommend that
 “ new and corrupt Edition of the *Hebrew Bible*,
 “ to which they do in general but too exactly
 “ agree. He observes 9. That these *Chaldee*
 “ *Paraphrases* do so fully and frequently speak of
 “ the *Jews Messias*, and so freely and honestly in-
 “ terpret the ancient Prophecies of him, contra-
 “ ry to what the later *Jews* have frequently
 “ done; they do, so freely own many Texts
 “ of the Old Testament, since expounded
 “ by the *Jews* otherwise, to belong to the *Mes-*
 “ *sias*, as did * *Trypho the Jew* about the middle
 “ of this second Century; that one would most

* Just. Dialog. cum Tryph. p. 316. & alibi passim.

“ natu-

“ naturally suppose, their Authors to have liv’d
 “ at or before that Time. And they do also so
 “ often, and with such Joy, speak of this *Mes-*
 “ *sias* as their King, that one would also most
 “ naturally suppose they were written when that
 “ Nation was in great Expectation of the com-
 “ ing of some temporal *Messias*, and of the Ad-
 “ vancement of his Kingdom in this World.
 “ Which Thing does so exactly agree to the
 “ Days of *Rabbi Akiba*, and of *Barcochab* the
 “ *Messias*, whom he attested to, on whom that
 “ Nation seem to have hazarded their All, and
 “ to whose Days that Chronology had been ad-
 “ justed, as observed * above, that it cannot
 “ but be supposed this to have been the Time,
 “ and this the Occasion of these *Chaldee Para-*
 “ *phrases*; namely, of the Old *Targums* of *On-*
 “ *kelos* and *Jonathan*, now extant, and of *Aquila*
 “ long since lost. For as to the later, they are
 “ either Extracts out of, or Imitations and Im-
 “ provements of these old original *Paraphrases*;
 “ and so do not here come under our pre-
 “ sent Consideration. He observes 10. That
 “ the *Jews* Alteration of the known Partition of
 “ the Books of the Old Testament, by that
 “ Time the *Targum* of *Jonathan* upon the Pro-
 “ phets was made, and especially leaving *Daniel*
 “ out of the Number of these Prophets, among
 “ whom he was reckon’d in the Days of *Jose-*
 “ *phus*, with the consequent Omission of any
 “ *Paraphrase* at all upon that Book, do afford
 “ great Reason to suspect, that there were then
 “ some dangerous Designs of the *Jews* upon the
 “ Anvil; and that there was somewhat in this
 “ Book particularly disagreeable to those Designs.
 “ Now what was thus disagreeable may be easi-

* p. 227. prius.

“ ly known, if we remember that this *Daniel*
 “ had foretold the coming of the *Messias*, exact-
 “ ly in the Days of *Jesus* of *Nazareth*; that all
 “ the *East* expected him then accordingly; that
 “ he had expressly foretold, contrary to the grand
 “ Principle of the *Jews* then, that the *Messias*
 “ should be cut off; that he had foretold, that
 “ the *Fourth* or *Roman* Monarchy should destroy
 “ the *Jewish* Nation; and that ^u a Stone cut out of a
 “ Mountain without Hands, or the *Messias*, raised
 “ up by a divine, invisible Power, should de-
 “ stroy the Remains of the four Monarchies,
 “ and set up an everlasting Kingdom; that *Je-*
 “ *sus* of *Nazareth*, had solemnly appeal’d to this
 “ Prophet for that Prediction, that the *Romans*
 “ should destroy *Jerusalem*, with the Temple
 “ and Polity of the *Jewish* Nation; and that ^x
 “ *Josephus* had owned, that That Destruction
 “ by *Titus*, was the fulfilling of this Prophecy,
 “ as our Saviour had applied it 38 Years before-
 “ hand. Upon this, Mr. *Whiston* seems to think;
 “ that as in other Books the *Jews* chiefly aim’d
 “ to corrupt particular Texts, so in this they
 “ rather aim’d at suppressing, or discountenan-
 “ cing the Book itself, so far as they were able,
 “ among both *Jews* and *Christians*. And this
 “ fruitful Lie fails not to produce another; for
 “ he says, that the *Jews* have dropp’d a Clause
 “ in the Book of *Y Ecclesiasticus* also, with this
 “ very View of diminishing the Credit of *Da-*
 “ *niel*, as not worthy the Name of a Prophet.
 “ For in our present Copies of that Book, when
 “ the Author had successively recommended *I-*
 “ *saiah*, *Jeremiah* and *Ezekiel* the Prophets, he

^t Dan. ix. 24—27. See p. 98. prius.

^x Antiq. 10. 12. p. 354, 355. ii. p. 348.
20. xlix. 6—10.

^u Dan. ix. 26, 27.

^y Chap. xlviii.

“ says not a Word of *Daniel*, but proceeds immediately to the twelve minor Prophets.

Eleventhly, “ That the Copy of the *Greek* Version, which *Origen* took into his *Hexaplar* Edition, and in which his Additions were inserted, and Defects were noted with *Asterisks* and *Obeli*, seems to have been no other than such a *Greek* Copy, in some measure corrected or corrupted by the *Jews* already. Notwithstanding the Care which *Origen* took to settle a true genuine Standard for the *Greek* of the Old Testament, &c. For the nearer it came to the *Hebrew* Reading, so much the more likely to have been given him by those learned *Jews* who had taught him *Hebrew*.

Twelfthly, “ The *Jews* have plainly corrupted some of the *Apocryphal* Books, about the Beginning of the second Century, and therefore may justly be suspected of having done the like at the same time to the *Canonical*. Thus, to say nothing of the Suspicions there may be of the *Jews* Suppression or Corruption of some Book or Books ascribed to *Ezrah*, or *Esdra*s, a Prophet under the Captivity of *Babylon*, such namely as our fourth Book of *Esdra*s in the *Latin*, and the most part of it in the *Arabick* Copy, do in some sort contain at this Day; It is well known, that after the Succession of the old *Jewish* inspired Prophets was over, the *Jews* had several other very good, true and valuable Books written among them, either in *Chaldee*, or in *Greek*. This is attested by ² *Josephus* their great Historian, and ² was acknowledged in the *Apostolick* Age. And there was no doubt of the Truth of any of those Books

² Joseph. contr. Apion. p. 1036. ² Constitut. ii. 51.
p. 256. 1. Clem. S. 55. Ignat. ad Magnes. S. 3.

“ at that Time, yet they came afterwards to
 “ doubt of them. This appears in the History of
 “ *Susannah*, and the Objections raised against it
 “ by *Africanus* in the Beginning of the third Cen-
 “ tury, and at the same time attempted to be
 “ answer’d by *Origen*; and this also appears by
 “ the present Book of *Judith* in particular. And
 “ thus also Mr. *Whiston* wisheth that the Truth of
 “ the History of *Judith* might be restored to its
 “ Integrity, for that he judgeth it to have been
 “ corrupted by the *Jews*: The same Opinion he
 “ entertains of the Histories of *Susannah*, *Bel*,
 “ and the *Dragon*, &c.

Thirteenthly, “ That the *Jews*, about the Be-
 “ ginning of the second Century, voluntarily
 “ corrupted or alter’d their sacred Books, seems
 “ highly probable; because, at the very same
 “ time, as is proved *Prop. V.* they dropp’d the
 “ old Characters, and old Copies of the same
 “ Books; and gave their Nation, and the Chri-
 “ stians with them, in their stead, new Copies
 “ in a new Character. What could the *Jewish*
 “ *Rabbins* and Rulers mean by changing at so
 “ critical a Juncture, the writing of their sacred
 “ Books, from the genuine and original *Hebrew*
 “ and *Samaritan* Letters, and thus introducing
 “ the novel *Affyrian* or *Chaldean* Letters in their
 “ Room? But to drop all the old Books, and
 “ render the Enquiry into the ancient Text ve-
 “ ry difficult, and, after some time, by degrees
 “ utterly impracticable.

Fourteenthly, “ That before the Beginning of
 “ the second Century, we never meet with those
 “ Inconsistancies and Contradictions in the Books
 “ of the Old Testament, we have ever since been
 “ puzzled with. When we look either into the
 “ later Books of the Old Testament, with re-
 “ gard to the former, or into the Books of the

“ *Apo-*

“ *Apocrypha* of *Aristeas*, *Philo*, and *Josephus*, in-
 “ to those of the New Testament, or the *Aposto-*
 “ *lical Fathers*, with regard to them all, we still
 “ find the Signs of a perfect Harmony and Con-
 “ cert among those Books; the Quotations are
 “ still of a piece, uniform and agreeable one to
 “ another. The Allegations of the Texts be-
 “ longing to the *Messias*, are owned still by all,
 “ as belonging to him, and to him only; no Ne-
 “ cessity appears of violently obtruding secondary
 “ Senses on any of the Predictions; nor are Pro-
 “ phesies belonging literally to others, my-
 “ stically apply’d to him, for the Proof that
 “ *Jesus of Nazareth* was the true *Messias*. We
 “ still find both Friends and Foes generally a-
 “ greed in the Integrity of those Copies, and the
 “ Truth of the Citations from them: We find
 “ few or no Indications, few or no Complaints
 “ of Difficulties in the Chronology of Scripture;
 “ of seeming Absurdities and Contradictions in
 “ comparing the several Accounts together: In
 “ short, till the Second Century, we find no E-
 “ vidence for the greatest part of those apparent
 “ Dislocations, Disorders, Differences and Con-
 “ tradictories, of which our modern Comments
 “ and Conciliators give us such a long Detail;
 “ which have so much perplex’d the Virtuous and
 “ Religious, and been so great a Stumbling-
 “ block, to the Vicious and Profane, ever
 “ since that Age. Surely we should one way or
 “ other have heard of some the principal, at least
 “ those apparent Difficulties, from either Hea-
 “ thens, *Jews* or Christians, before the second
 “ Century, if they had been so many, and so hard
 “ to solve, as they have appear’d ever since that
 “ time; and of which we have been sufficiently
 “ sensible, ever since the *Jews* gave *Origen* the
 “ present Copies of the Old Testament.

Finally, By way of an Appendix, or Overmeasure, Mr. *Whiston* pretends to set forth the manner how Corruption was brought into those Copies of the *Greek Translation* used by the *Christians*, p. 264. "That when the Christians understood, that their Reading widely differ'd from the Reading of the *Jewish Copies*, and were easily induc'd to believe, that the *Jews* had more exact Copies, because they made use both of the *Hebrew* and *Greek*, they might allow or procure Copies to be transcrib'd more agreeable to these of the *Jews*, than formerly. ^b And so they might introduce great Variations of Readings into their own Copies, and insensibly approach nearer to the *Jewish Copies*, back'd as they were told by the original *Hebrew*. But that no Body may suppose such an universal Corruption to be impossible, our Adversary further observes, p. 266. that the *Jews* themselves confess, that all the present *Hebrew Copies*, have no fewer than 28 *Pieces of Verses*, or imperfect *Clauses*; which he takes to be a direct Indication, that they all proceeded from, or have been corrected by some one ancient Copy, which having so many *Clauses* worn out by the length of Time, or accidentally wanting, the Rulers ordered all the Rest to be adjusted to it, without supplying those evident Defects from other Copies, even in the plainest Cases: Which being supposed, as it cannot well be denied, he concludes, that it was certainly in the Power of such Rulers. 1. To corrupt that one Book, and that a great deal in the Sense, by a small Change in the Words. 2. To cry up this ancient

^b See p. 221. prius.

“ Manuscript Copy, as the best, the oldest, and
 “ the most accurate. 3. To make a Decree that
 “ all the future Copies, at least, that were to be
 “ esteem’d the most Authentick, and used as
 “ such in their *Synagogues*, should be made or
 “ corrected according to it, the like to which
 “ the ^c *Jews* have frequently done in the latter
 “ Ages. 4. To ordain that their Copies should
 “ be no longer written in the old *Hebrew* or *Sa-*
 “ *maritan* Characters, but in the *Chaldean*. 5. To
 “ procure a great Number of Transcripts in the
 “ *Chaldee* Character, according to that Book.
 “ 6. To Decree, after this authentick *Hebrew*
 “ Copy was once generally receiv’d, that the
 “ *Greek* Copies of that Nation, especially those
 “ to be us’d in any of their *Synagogues*, should
 “ be also gradually corrected by it. All which
 “ Recommendations, with the Authority of new
 “ *Greek* Versions, made from these Copies, and
 “ the Support of Novel *Chaldee Paraphrases*, ex-
 “ plaining them, would be abundantly sufficient,
 “ within no large Compass of Years, to render
 “ such new Copies authentick, and gradually to
 “ sink and wear off the Knowledge and Repu-
 “ tation of the old ones; especially while the
 “ ancient *Samaritan* Bibles, which alone could
 “ detect the Corruption, would soon be dropp’d
 “ among them, and be illegible by them. And
 “ p. 269. proceeding to point out the Authors
 “ of these Corruptions, he says: All which Cir-
 “ cumstances do so exactly agree with *Akiba*,
 “ the great *Jewish Rabbi* at that Time, with his
 “ Disciple *Aquila*, and Associate *Onkelos*, and their
 “ contemporary *Jonathan*; that I cannot, but with
 “ the learned Monsieur ^d *Pezron*, esteem the Be-
 “ ginning of the second Century to be the very

^c Walton Polyglot. proleg. 8. Prop. 5. priùs.
 Defense de l’antiquité de tems. C. 6.

^d De-

“ Time, *Tiberias* the very Place, these the very
 “ Persons, and these already assigned the very
 “ Reasons of this fatal Alteration of the *Hebrew*;
 “ and thence afterward of the like fatal Altera-
 “ tion of the *Greek* of the Old Testament, &c.
 “ which seems indeed to have stopp’d the Pro-
 “ gress of the Gospel, especially among the *Jew-*
 “ *ish* Nation, for near 16 Hundred Years to-
 “ gether, and which until it is acknowledged and
 “ corrected, is likely to stop the Conversion of
 “ that Nation to the *Christian* Religion, for all
 “ future Generations, &c. ^e Again, since we
 “ have found the *Jews* so wicked, as to have vo-
 “ luntarily corrupted not only the *Apocrypha*,
 “ but what they allowed to be sacred Scriptures
 “ themselves, there will be Reason to suspect,
 “ that they have sometimes done the same with
 “ their own Historian *Josephus*; especially in the
 “ famous Passage which is in all our Copies, and
 “ was in *Eusebius’s* and *Jerom’s* Copies, but
 “ seems to have been wanting in those made use
 “ of by *Origen*, who was a Scholar to some *Jew-*
 “ *ish* Rabbins, and so probably might have his
 “ Copy of *Josephus* from them, &c.” Next ^f he
 asserts, “ Nay it is evident, that *Josephus* so un-
 “ derstood *Daniel’s* famous *seventy Weeks Prophe-*
 “ *cy*, of the Destruction of the *Jewish* Temple
 “ and City by the *Romans*, as our Lord applied
 “ it; and that he so understood his other Pro-
 “ phesy, concerning *the Stone cut out of the*
 “ *Mountain without Hands* (or the *Messiah*) as
 “ to intimate that he took it to be nearly ful-
 “ filled; and that those who consider’d that Book,
 “ might discover how it was to be fulfilled.
 “ All which Things put together imply, that
 “ when *Josephus* wrote those Antiquities, he had
 “ a strong Suspicion, if not an inward Belief,

^e p. 270.^f p. 280.

“ that *Jesus of Nazareth* was the true *Messiah*;
 “ especially, if we still farther consider, what a
 “ notable Character he gives of *John the Baptist*
 “ the Forerunner; and of *James the Just*, the
 “ Brother of our Lord, in other more unque-
 “ stionable Passages of these *Antiquities*”. Thus
 far hath Mr. *Whiston* patch’d or tack’d together
 Matters of a very different Nature, in Defence
 of the same Proposition.

ii. This is a new Fetch of our artful Disputant,
 that when he could not convince the Readers by
 the Weight and Strength of his Reasons, he
 thought the wisest Way would be to perplex or
 overpower them, with the Number and Variety
 of the Things thrown in, that the Snake in the
 Grass may not be instantly discovered. But we
 shall take the Pains to pursue him regularly step
 by step, and so following in the same Track,
 shall with all possible Brevity search into the Bot-
 tom of those Accusations, which he has heap’d
 together, not so much against the *Jews*, as a-
 gainst the Scripture itself. He says,

1. First, That the *Jews* authorize and approve
 of the corrupting of Scripture in their *Talmud*;
 which when he himself, being unacquainted with
 that Literature, could not consult, he sends us to
Pezron and *Walton*, in the Places before referr’d
 to. The first of those is taken from the Tract
 8. *Jebammoth*, אמר ר' יוחנן משום ר' שמעון בן הוצק
 מוטב שתעקר אות אחת מן התורה ויתקדש שם שמים
 בפרהסיא *Rabbi Jochannan, in the Name of Rabbi*
Simeon, the Son of Josedec, said: it is better to take
one Letter out of the Law, that the Name of the
Heavens (or, of the God of Heaven) may be pub-
lickly sanctified: Which saying a little before also
Rabbi Jochannan declar’d, in the Name of Rabbi

Chijab, the Son of *Aba*; only, that in Place of the Verb *יִקְדָּשׁ* may be sanctified, he hath it, *וְאֵל חֲחֻלִּי* may not be prophaned. But what the Masters intend by that Maxim, the Context declares. In that Place, they are speaking of the History related 2 Sam. xxi. 1—14. when *David* is said to have deliver'd up the Sons of *Saul* to be hang'd by the *Gibeonites*, because their Father had exercis'd Cruelty upon those innocent People, contrary to the League made with them and sworn to by *Joshua*. Here the *Talmudists* raise a twofold Doubt: First, with what Conscience could *David* do this, delivering up to Death the Children for the Father, when it is written *Deut. xxiv. 16. The Fathers shall not be put to Death for the Children, neither shall the Children be put to Death for the Fathers, &c.* Secondly, How it comes to pass, that the Bodies of Men hang'd should be left hanging for so long Time, that *Rizpah* was obliged to keep watch over them, and to drive away the wild Beasts and Birds of Prey from them, when yet it is written again, *Deut. xxi. 23. His Body (viz. of him who is hang'd) shall not remain all Night upon the Tree, but thou shalt in any wise bury him that Day?* The Masters or Rabbins answer: When the Glory of God's Name is concern'd, it is lawful to take one Letter out of the Law, *i. e.* to recede from the Law in one or two Circumstances. Therefore both these Things were done lawfully: For because *Saul* had slighted the religious Oath, by which *Joshua* had taken the *Gibeonites* under the Protection of *Israel*, ch. ix. 15, &c. as well also, because he himself had profaned the Name of God, and had given Occasion for the neighbouring Nations to profane it; upon these Accounts, they had justly receded from the Commandment of the Law; on the one Hand, by revenging

the Treachery and Cruelty of the Father upon his Children and Posterity; and on the other Hand, by leaving the Bodies of them that were hang'd, in the open Air and unburied for some Days. It is plain then, that the *Talmudick* Maxim does not allow of any Mutilation of the written Law, to be made, by the taking away or altering of any single Letter (which is a Practice that the *Jewish* Nation have ever abhorr'd) but it permits the Transgression or Neglect of a Law in a special Case, when the Glory of God's Name is at Stake. For in such a Case, the Law may be understood to admit of a Dispensation: Which is much the same with what our blessed Saviour teaches us, *Matth. xii. 3.* that *David* in Case of Necessity transgress'd the Law, and was blameless, *1 Sam. xxi. 6.* From hence then it is as clear as the Sun, how ignorantly, and how impertinently it is concluded from that Maxim, both by *Pezron* and Mr. *Whiston*, that the *Jews* were by their Principles, and of Course inclinable to corrupt the Law.

The other Place, upon which they Ground their Argument, is taken out of the Tract ^h *Megillah*, חנו רבנן כל המקראות הכתובים בתורה לגנאי קורין לשבח : כגון ישגלנה ישכבנה : בעופלים בשחורים : *The Rabbins have deliver'd it for a Rule to us; let all the Texts written in the Law obscenely, be read according to Decency.* For Example, the Word ישגלנה *Yashgolanah*, which is the obscene Word used for conjugal Cohabitation, they express in modefter Terms ישכבנה *Yashkavanah*, he shall sleep with her. בעופלים *Bagnufalem*, the Piles, is express'd more modestly בשחורים *Batchorem*, the Emerods. חריונים *Charjonem*, Doves-Dung, is read in more reserved Terms רביונים

Davjonem, the flowing of Doves, &c. This takes Place among קריין ורחיבן the *Keris* and *Cbetibs*, of which ⁱ we have spoken once above, and again ^k some time after, and ^l we also answer'd the Objection drawn from it. But every body at first Sight may discover, how weak the Pretence is. For when the *Masters* laid down such Rules, they did not so much as Dream of making any Mutilation or Corruption in the Copies; but they only instruct the Reader, not to offend the Ears of the Infirm, in the publick Assemblies, by any offensive or indecent Expression, but when he reads the sacred Texts to the People, he may substitute other Words of a modester Sound, but signifying the very same Thing. Whence it is, that you never see in any of those Places, these Words expunged, or altered, but only noted with a little Circle, and referring to the Margin, where the Reader is shewn what Word he is to substitute in reading the Law publickly, but never in transcribing it: So that one might justly wonder with what Face those *Bible-Scourgers* could ever alledge this Testimony in Confirmation of their Sentiments.

The *third* Place is cited upon the Credit of *Walton*, out of the Preface of ^m *Maimonides*, where the *Latin* Words in *Walton* rendered into *English* by Mr. *Whiston*, run thus: "The *Jews* were obliged by the Decrees of the " *Rabbins*, who dwelt in the Land of *Israel*, until the Collection of the *Talmud*, and afterward, of those who compos'd a *Sanhedrin* at " *Babylon*, when they were expell'd out of *Palestine*. And if that *Senate*, under Pretence of " amending had corrupted their Books, and had

ⁱ Crit. Sacri. p. 1. c. 7. S. 5. ע"ב. 2. ^k S. 6. ע"ב. 2. n. i.
^l Ib. cap. 6. S. 5. ע"ב. 3. lit. 3. ^m In Jad Hachazakah.

“ decreed that they should be transcrib’d accord-
 “ ingly, no *Jew* durst transcribe them, even to
 “ a single Letter, otherwise than that Decree
 “ appointed.” But I am afraid that *Walton*, a
 Man of consummate Learning and Industry,
 hath made a Slip here : For I have once and a-
 gain carefully read the whole הקדמה *Hakdamab*,
 or *Preface* of *Maimonides*, of the latest Edition of
Amsterdam, and I could find no such Thing in
 it about the Depravation of the sacred Books.
 Whoever hath the old *Venetian* Edition, which
 I have not in my Possessionⁿ, may search and en-
 quire into that Place. But after all, *Morinus*
 hath not quoted any such Passage as from *Mai-*
monides in the Place mentioned. For though *Mo-*
rinus labours hard to maintain a very false Per-
 suasion, “ That the *Jews* had a certain Senate,
 “ to whose Decrees the whole Nation dispers’d
 “ over all the World, chearfully submitted, as
 “ being bound to it by the most sacred Ties ;
 “ and if any Man was ever so little reluctant, he
 “ was instantly to be put out of the *Synagogue*,
 “ and laid under an Interdict ;” ° and though he
 produces and translates into *Latin*, Word for
 Word, six distinct Testimonies, from the Pre-
 face of *Maimonides*, to make a Shew with his Au-
 thority ; yet he produces nothing at all in Proof
 of that Position, which *Walton* gives us under
 the Name of *Maimonides*. But what deceived that
 excellent *English* Author was, that P *Morinus* him-
 self, though without Right or Reason, does real-

ⁿ I have consulted that *Venetian* Edition of *Maimonides*,
 A. D. 1550. (in *Sion-College Library*) and do assure the Rea-
 der, that there is no such Passage as Mr. Whiston, after *Wal-*
ton, has quoted, in it ; but in the Book itself, are more Pas-
 sages than one, directly contrary to Mr. Whiston’s Pretences.

MOSES MARCUS.

° p. 25.

p. S. 12. p. 29.

ly draw such a Conclusion from the Testimonies of the *Rabbins* there quoted; and *Walton*, in refuting it, as if it were *Maimonides's*, vainly engages against Shadows and Phantoms only. Upon the whole then, we insist upon it, that *Mr. Whiston* point out and produce that Place in *Maimonides*, before we return him an answer to it. Indeed, the *Jews* do set too great a Value upon the Decrees of their Doctors, and are at the very Point of extolling them above the Authority of the written Law; and from thence have proceeded those familiar Sayings, which *Mr. Whiston*, with his Master *Pezron*, has produced and urged, but each of them in his own Mother Language, without acquainting us, either with Place or Author: For Example, בְּנֵי הַחוּרִים בְּרַבְרֵי סוֹפְרִים יוֹתֵר מִבְּרַי תּוֹרָה *My Son, attend to the Words of the Scribes, more than to the Words of the Law*: And again, כָּל דְּבָרֵיהֶם רַבֵּי אֱלֹהִים *All their Words are the Words of the living God*. And to these many other more considerable Sayings might be added, if that were our present Business. But yet, from thence you will never be able to conclude any thing, as to any Corruption of the written Law designedly undertaken and effected by them. For with what religious Fidelity, yea (as we may say) Superstition, they have endeavour'd to preserve the ancient Reading of the Scripture whole and entire, even *Walton*, * and we, and others, have made appear, to whom we have refer'd above; so that there is no Room left, for so much as a Suspicion of their designedly corrupting the Text. As to the Interpretation of Scripture, in which

* Ex Cod. *Berachoth*. cap. i. fol. 3. col. 2.

Cod. *Shabbath*, cap. ii. fol. 30. col. 2.

S. 4.

* Crit. Sacr. p. i. cap. 3. S. 4. עמ"ס. 2. ad loc. Rom. iii. 2. rursusque עמ"ס. 4.

* Ex

* Cit. loco

indeed the *Jewish* Masters, especially the *Cabbalists*, indulge themselves too much Liberty; that is a Matter of very different Consideration from what relates to preserving and handing down to Posterity the Reading of the Text, in which they have shewn themselves more religiously scrupulous than many *Christians*. But perhaps we have said rather too much upon this Head, though not without Reason, since this Argument of Mr. *Whiston*, which he has placed in the Front, carries something of a plausible Colour with it.

2. As to what our Adversary urgeth of the Obstinacy and Stubborness of the *Jews* against our Saviour, his Worship and Religion, I do not deny that it is a Bar to their Conversion, and that it leaves no room for the wholesome Admonitions of those who would instruct them out of the Scripture Oracles; but that it ever carried them to such lengths, as to have made them offer Violence to the sacred Copies, and corrupt the Text, of which they are the warmest Advocates and Defenders, can no way be demonstrated from that Topick. Neither do they think, that they need any such desperate Remedy: For, as to the clearest Characters, by which the coming of the *Messiah* is prov'd to be long since past, and other Prophecies of Scripture, which make against their Infidelity, they have their petty Answers in Readiness; weak enough in Truth, but yet such as they are wonderfully pleas'd with, and pride themselves in: Whence they prefix the Title נצחון *Netzachon* to their Polemical Books against the *Christians*, promising to themselves certain *Victory*, and before the Victory proclaiming Triumph. Neither doth Mr. *Whiston* alledge very proper Vouchers of the supposed Corruption, viz. *Irenæus*, *Justin Martyr*, and *Jerom*, to whom we might add *Tertullian*,

u *Atba-*

u *Athanasius*, and *Chrysostom*; whose Testimonies however * *Bellarmino* so accounts for, as that they did not write those Things about the *Hebrew* Text, nor against the *Jews*, but that they were to be understood as pointed against *Aquila*, *Theodotion* and *Symmachus*, who were *Jewish* Apostates, and made new Translations: To which we may add, that mostly when they complain'd of the Corruption of the sacred Books, they did not speak of the *Hebrew* Copies, but of the *Septuagint* *Greek* Copies; which, as is plain from the Dialogue of *Justin Martyr* with *Trypho*, the *Crucifying Jews* did corrupt. We have spoken of *Jerom* above γ. As to his Opinion, we must carefully observe to distinguish Times: For before he had acquir'd the Knowledge of the *Hebrew* Language, he pass'd too severe a Judgment, both upon the *Jews* and the *Hebrew* Copy; but after he had consulted the original Text, and carefully compar'd it with the Translations, he dropp'd his former Opinion, and zealously maintain'd the Perfection of the Original. Not to mention, that *Mr. Whiston* could produce no Testimony from those *Fathers*, which charges the *Jews* with any real and actual Injury done to the *Hebrew* Copies by them.

3. Our Adversary succeeds no better in his *third* Argument, founded upon mere Conjectures, and not hanging well together. For it is not true that (because the *Jews* in their Disputes with the *Christians*, were reduced to such Straits by the Scripture Texts, that a great Part of them, convinced of the Truth in their own Minds, laid aside their Infidelity, and list'd themselves into the Service of *Christ*) the rest turning

u In Synopsi Script. * Lib. ii. de verbo Dei cap. 2.
 γ Crit. Sacr. p. 11. cap. 2. S. 7. c. 4.

their Resentment against their own Copies, corrupted the sacred Text ; but the Truth is, that neglecting the Reading and Interpretation of Scripture, which they found no way favourable to them, they employ'd their Thoughts chiefly in the Study of traditionary Doctrines, and harden'd their own People against the *Christian* Religion, with *Pharisaical* and other Traditions, derived from their Forefathers. And indeed, the Circumstance of those very unsettled Times requir'd it to be so; when being expell'd from their own Habitations, stripp'd and depriv'd of their Religion, Polity, Temple, Books, Riches, and sacerdotal Order, they were intent only upon this one thing, that they might in any Degree restore their Religion, so shatter'd and broken to Pieces, and that they might be more solicitous about preferring their Worship, and the outward Privileges, Rites and Ceremonies, both of their sacred Offices, and of their private Life; and about transmitting them to their Posterity, according to the Discipline of their Forefathers, than about a diligent revising of the sacred Copies. And that it was so done, is evident in Fact, because chiefly at this Time, the *Mishnaical* Work compil'd by *Rabbi Jehuda the Holy*, shews what they had most at Heart in this Age, and to what Studies they were chiefly devoted. * See what we have before observed to this Purpose. As to what Mr. *Whiston* further adds, that the *Christians* of that Age were unacquainted with the *Hebrew* Literature, though it is not altogether true, yet it makes against himself, because the *Jews* had done very absurdly in corrupting the *Hebrew* Copies, which could have been of no Use against the *Christians*, and which if they had suddenly

* Crit. Sacr. P. i. cap. 6, S. 2. c. 2.

varied from the *Greek Versions*, would rather have convicted the *Jews* of Forgery, than have given them Grounds to hope for any Advantage from them.

4. His *fourth* Argument, how much sooner it amounts to, being supported only by his *second Proposition*, falls together with it; and since ^a we have confuted it above, there is no need of adding any thing to what was there said. Certainly, Mr. *Whiston* himself cannot be thought to have confided much in it, since he rather hinted it in very few Words, than dwelt upon it. And after all, where is the Consequence of this Reasoning; viz. because the *Hebrew* and *Greek Copies* well agreed in the first Century, but before the middle of the second Century, they happen'd to differ widely; therefore it follows, that the *Jews* corrupted both of them, out of hatred truly towards the *Christian Religion*? Such reasoning as this, is but a Rope of Sand. Not to mention, that according to Mr. *Whiston's Hypothesis*, the very same Corruptions should be supposed to have been brought into the same Book, and the *Greek* should have been made conformable to the depraved *Hebrew*, and by this means the Inference should have been drawn, not so much from their Difference, as from their Harmony and Consent in the corrupted Places.

5. He hath taken more Pains in setting out his *fifth* Argument, by which he endeavours to prove, that the Corruption of the Chronology in the *Pentateuch* was designedly undertaken. We do not deny, that a remarkable Change hath been made in the *Greek Pentateuch*, as to the Numbers of Years: But we have shewn elsewhere, that the *Hebrew Pentateuch*, preserves the primitive Numbers whole and entire to this Day. And pray, what Mad-

ness would it have been in the *Jews*, to have altered the *Hebrew* Numbers on Account of the *Christians*, who (as Mr. *Whiston* acknowledgeth) being ignorant of the Language, did not understand them, nor were capable of summing them up? But if he shall say, that the *Rabbins* attempted this Villainy for the Sake of the *Jews*, lest they should perceive from the Computation of Times, that the *Messiah* was come; it must indeed appear wonderful how it came to pass, that those of them, who knew nothing about the Contrivance of this Corruption, who must of Necessity have been the major Part, did not immediately observe and confront the Fraud by their own perfect Copies, at that Time liable to no Suspicion of Corruption. Suppose then, that the *Greek* Numbers were corrupted, out of a very ill Design, that is nothing to us, who are speaking of the *Hebrew*, not of the *Greek*, the Corruption of which we freely admit, both in chronological Accounts, and in other Places innumerable. And as to the Tradition of *Elias*, about the six thousand Years of the World, with which the whole Age of the World should be determined, it neither favours Mr. *Whiston's* Opinion, nor the *Greek* Calculation. ^b It is read in these Words רבי אליהו ששת אלפים שנה. הוי עלמא שני אלפים תוהו שני אלפים תורה שני אלפים ימור: המשיח ובעונותינו שרבו יצאו מהם מור: שיצאו *The Tradition of the House of Elias is: The World endures six thousand Years. Two thousand Years Emptiness: Two thousand Years the Law: Two thousand Years the Days of the Messiah. But because of our Sins, which are many, those have passed which are past.* The *Jews*, being solicitous about the End of the first Period, do

^b In *Gemara Babylonica* cod. *Sanhedrin*. cap. 11. fol. 97. col. 1.

not extend it to *Israel's* going out of *Egypt*, and the solemn Promulgation of the Law from Mount *Sinai*, because that Space of Time exceeds two thousand Years, by above five hundred from the Creation of the World; but they fix it upon the Call of *Abraham* from *Ur* of the *Chaldees*, Gen. xii. 5. ^c as they expressly determine it in the *Babylonish Gemara*; where after the Tradition of *Elias* in the very same Words, they ask: " From what Time those two thousand Years under the Law are to be computed? For if we should say, that they are to be reckon'd from the giving out of the Law thus far (*i. e. even to the End of the four Thousand*) that cannot be, because that Interval contains not so many Years. For if you consider more accurately, the first two thousand Years, which have run out from the Creation of the World, you will find, that of the third thousand Years there have already passed beyond them some hundreds, with tens and units, to the Promulgation of the Law. Wherefore we must say, that the two thousand Years, which belong to the Law, ought to take their Beginning from that Point of Time, of which these Words do speak, Gen. xii. 5. *And the Souls that they had gotten in Haran, &c.*" We do not now enquire whether it is right or wrong, that the *Talmudists* fix the End of the first Period, which the House of *Elias* calleth that of *Emptiness*, and the Beginning of the Second, which is called *of the Law*, upon *Abraham's* Removal from his native Country: We only shew, what Numbers, whether *Hebrew* or *Greek*, may be most fitly apply'd to this Tradition, to which *Mr. Whiston* appeals. If you settle your Calcula-

^c In *Gemara Babyl. cod. Avoda Sara. cap. 1. ad Misch. 3. fol. 9. col. 1.*

tions by the *Hebrew* Copy, you will have from the Creation of the World to the Flood 1656 Years, and from thence to the Call of *Abram*, 427, and then, all this first Period amounts to 2083 Years, according to ^d what we have clearly demonstrated in our Chronological Table of *Genesis*. Yet no one can doubt, that the Author of this Tradition, intended to make use of a definite and round Number, in describing the Periods of Times, in which he makes no Account, of the Excess of 83 Years, which doth not come up to a Century. But then again, the *Greek* Copy reckons, from the Creation of the World to the Flood 2240; from this, to the going out of *Abram* from *Ur* of the *Chaldees* ^e, 1172. And this ^f *Spanheim* hath demonstrated. Whence the Sum of the Years of the first *Epoch* of *Elias* amounts to, 3412 Years. And now let Mr. *Whiston* consider, if the Tradition of the House of *Elias*, is to be the Rule to go by, in judging of Years reckon'd up in both Texts, whether we should hold by the *Hebrew*, as it stands at present, or by the *Greek*. But further, if we look thoroughly into the end of the second *Epoch* of *Elias*, which is that of the *Law*, whether it fall upon the Beginning of the *Christian Æra*, or upon the Destruction of *Jerusalem*, and the final Overthrow of the *Jewish* Common-wealth, it again confirms our Calculations. For though in the Judgment of ^g *Spanheim*, “ The exact Determination of the true Year, in which Christ was born, may be in vain expected amidst so great a Variety of Opinions, both because of the dubious Characters, assign'd us in the History of

^d In Introduct. Bibl. p. 1. Cap. 4. S. 5. p. 66, &c. ^e Juxta Edit. Sixtin. & Plantin. ^f In Canone Epochæ 1, & 2, opp. T. 1. f. 219, &c. ^g In Hist. Eccl. Christ. Sect. 1. T. 1. opp. f. 522.

“ the Gospel, as also because of the Disagree-
 “ ment of the ancient *Christians* among them-
 “ selves, and their Neglect in fixing of this *E-*
 “ *poch*, and in consulting the Censor’s Rolls”.
 Yet the Difference of a few Years in computing
 thousands, where we take a round Number, sig-
 nifies very little. ^h *James Usher* determinately
 fixes the Nativity of *Christ* upon the 4000 Year
 of the World, which is the 4710 of the *Julian*
 Period; ⁱ *Frid. Spanheim*, the Son, fixes it to
 the Year of the Creation of the World 4003, of
 the *Julian* Period 4713; others determine it a
 little differently; but almost all agree, that about
 the End of the fourth thousandth Year of the
 World, *Christ*, who being τέλος νόμου, *the End of the*
Law, hath put a final Period to the legal *Epoch*,
 came into the World to be incarnate. But can
 it be imagin’d, that the *Jews* should have con-
 trived so ill for themselves, as by corrupting the
Hebrew Numbers (which, according to Mr. *Whi-*
ston, originally reach’d a great deal farther) to
 bring them precisely to that very Period of Time,
 in which they knew, that *Jesus of Nazareth* came
 into the World? Thus indeed from the Tradi-
 tion of *Elias*, it might be demonstrated, that
Jesus of Nazareth was the *Messiah*, and the *Jews*
 must be convinced from their own Principles, of
 his being actually come. And now let Mr. *Whi-*
ston consider, how unadvisedly he has brought in
 the Tradition of the House of *Elias*, blindly fol-
 lowing his blind Guides *Isaac Vossius*, and *Paul*
Pezron.

6. Mr. *Whiston*’s sixth Argument is so far from
 serving him, that it may be turn’d against him,
 and may be made use of to disprove the pretend-
 ed *Jewish* Corruption, by such as maintain the

^h In Annal. T. 2. p. 531.

ⁱ Opp. T. 1. f. 246.

Integrity of the *Hebrew* Text. If the *Jews* had intended by corrupting of the Scriptures, to wrest out of the Hands of *Christians*, or to blunt those Weapons which they make use of against the *Jews*, doubtless they would have corrupted those Texts, by which *Jesus* of *Nazareth* is prov'd to be the *Messiah*. But we find it quite otherwise, and all those Places, viz. *Gen.* xlix. 10. *Deut.* xviii. 15—18. *Isai.* vii. 14, 15. ix. 6. liii. *Jer.* xxiii. 5, 6. compar'd with *chap.* xxxiii. 14, 15. *Mic.* v. 2. *Hag.* ii. 7, 9. *Mal.* iii. 1, &c. iv. 5, 6. remain entire; neither is there any doubt made about them, nor are they suspected of Corruption by our Adversaries themselves. So that we may turn his Argument the other way, and Reason thus: Since those Texts, by which chiefly the Infidelity of the *Jews* is refuted and overthrown, and which the *Christian* Church, from its Infancy, hath made use of against them, and still continues to do so with very happy Success, have remained entire and uncorrupted in the *Hebrew* Copy; from hence it manifestly appears, that the *Jews* have not designedly corrupted or injured it. Neither does the famous Instance, which Mr. *Whiston* produces from *Matth.* i. 22. demonstrate the contrary: For first it falls out well, that he meets with nothing in the Text itself, which any Caviller might find fault with; his only Scruple is about the following Words of the Prophet, as to which, either the Angel, or the holy Spirit, judg'd it would be beside the Purpose, to add them to the former Words in *Matth.* i. But our Antagonist refers them to the Prophet's Son, and believes them to be misplac'd, and that they ought to be inserted after the third Verse of the eighth Chapter: For he scruples not to espouse the Cause of the *Jews*, if by any means he may but wound the Authority of Scripture.

ture. But this he does, by very much forcing and straining the Text: For the whole Scope and Connexion of the Narrative, requires and demands a continued Link and Series of those Verses, from the 10th to the 16th. God had freely offer'd to *Abaz*, who refus'd to ask it, a Sign for delivering *Jerusalem* from the Insults of *Pekab* and *Rezin*; a Sign so illustrious, that the whole *Jewish* Church might depend upon it: For that the Posterity of *David* should be so far from being cut off in *Abaz*, by those Enemies, that on the contrary, in times to come, the *Messiah* should be born of a Virgin of that Race and Family, who was to be *Immanuel*, *Θεὸς μετ' ἡμῶν*, *God-man*. That he should not only shew himself to be *Immanuel* at that Time, by being a present help, defence, and comfort to the afflicted Church, but by this Prophecy, he further gave them a symbolical Assurance of their Deliverance. And that Symbol was to be taken from a Comparison of the Interval of Time, which should pass from the Birth of the *Messiah* to his Years of Discretion, with that Interval which should be between the then present Time of that hostile Oppression, and the Death of those two Kings who were their Enemies; so that the Kingdoms of *Syria* and *Israel* should be destroy'd, and depriv'd of their Kings, within a shorter Space of Time, than should pass from the Nativity of the *Messiah* to his riper Age. Where also ^k *Camppeg. Vitranga* very well observes, and this he elsewhere ^l repeats and confirms, that when *Isaiah* gave this Prophecy, he being in an ecstatical Rapture, as is usual with Prophets, spoke about the Nativity of the *Messiah*, just as if it had been

^k Observat. Sacr. Lib. V. cap. 2. S. 11. pag. 26. ^l Comment. in h. l. Jes.

a Thing present; as if indeed that Virgin, who in future Ages was to conceive and bring forth that *Immanuel*, had been then present amongst the *Israelites*. “ Behold, says he, a Virgin conceives, (not shall conceive, and shall bring forth) and brings forth a Son, who is to be called *Immanuel*.” He therefore representing to himself the *Immanuel*, in a prophetical Rapture and Fiction, as then present, says: *Before this Child shall know to reject the evil, and choose the good, the Land which now gives thee so much Vexation, shall be forsaken of its two Kings.* As if he had spoken to the *Jews* to this Purpose: Imagine with me, that the Virgin who in times to come shall conceive, and bring forth *Immanuel*, is now present with you; I affirm to you, in the Name of God, that those Kings of the *Syrians* and *Ephraimites*, who now afflict you, shall survive no longer Space of Time in their Kingdoms, than what time is to run from the Birth of that *Immanuel* to the time of his growing up to Maturity of Judgment. Now suppose, what Mr. *Whiston* pleads for, that the 15th and 16th Verses belong not to this Place in the seventh Chapter, but to the eighth Chapter, then 1. Truly the Sign given by God, would have no relation at all to the then present Calamity, and the promis’d Deliverance from it; and yet it was purely for the sake of That, that God made known this Revelation to them. For might not the *Messiah* afterwards proceed from the Family of *David*, though at that Time *Jerusalem* had been taken, *Ahabaz* killed, and the Kingdom of *Judah* overthrown and destroy’d by the Army of the two hostile Kings? But to make them understand, that no such calamitous Event should happen, these two Verses are necessarily added, from which they might be appriz’d of the Death of those Kings,
and

and within what Space of Time it was to be expected. But on the other Hand, 2. this Verse would be altogether superfluous between the 3^d and 4th Verses of the eighth Chapter, where another Symbol is taken from the younger Son of the Prophet, to the same Purpose. Join together those different Verses, and observe what a patch'd up, and almost absurd Speech they would make. Not to mention, that 3. there would be no Connexion at all in the seventh Chapter, between the 14th and 17th Verses, if the intermediate ones were taken away; and yet there is a plain Connexion, when the 15th and 16th Verses are left in their proper Place. A *corrective* Exhortation immediately succeeds upon that of *Consolation*, and the Connexion between them runs thus: Though by this Sign of Deliverance given you, taken from the Birth of the *Messiah*, and by the Application of the same to the present Calamity, and the Assistance promised, as by a Symbol given from Heaven, the pious *Jews* may be assured, that *Judea* shall be suddenly delivered from the hostile Kings; yet that King *Abaz* mistrusting the divine Bounty and Favour, might understand how much on one Hand he had offended God by his Incredulity and Diffidence, and how on the other Hand, by seeking and imploring the Help of the *Assyrians*, he had brought the Kingdom of *Judah* into Danger; hereupon the Prophet immediately subjoins this threatening: That notwithstanding the Deliverance which he had promised, yet in times to come, the *Assyrians* should bring most grievous and terrible Calamities, both upon the Kingdom, and Kings of the Posterity of *Abaz*. But the whole Force, the whole Connexion of the Discourse will be lost, if you should take away those two Verses; which far from allowing any Dislocation of the Text,

we firmly maintain to be in their proper Place, and that they ought to be explain'd of the *Messiah*, for the Reasons before alledged.

7. As to his *seventh* Consideration, we have already own'd, that *Justin Martyr* is to be reckon'd among them who charge the *Jews* with corrupting the Scripture, notwithstanding which, the greater Part of the ancient Doctors, and almost all the modern, are of a different Opinion.

8, 9. Neither as to his *eighth* and *ninth* Observations, is it needful to add any more to what ^m we have professedly proved above, about the *Greek* Translations of *Aquila*, *Theodotion*, and *Symmachus* : for whoever shall attentively read those Considerations, and shall set them in Opposition to Mr. *Whiston's* trifling Objections, will need nothing further upon that Argument.

10. And as to those Observations, which our Adversary urgeth in the *tenth* Place, ⁿ we have elsewhere said what is sufficient, having plainly and fully set forth their Original, and Scope, and Age, together with their State and Condition. Neither doth the Exclusion of *Daniel* from the Catalogue of the Prophets make good Mr. *Whiston's* Hypothesis. But as to the Rank and Place, which *Daniel* holds in the *Jewish Hebrew* Code, we have spoken ^o at large ; and we have not scrupled to own, that the *Jews* were in some Measure prejudiced against *Daniel*; for which Reason, at this Day they avoid the reading of him ; and in their Disputations about the *Messiah*, they do not care to enter the Lists with us, upon the Arguments taken out of *Daniel*. But that during the whole first Century, they reckon'd it in the Rank of the prophetick Books, and that then immediately and on a sud-

^m Crit. Sacr. p. 2. Cap. 3.

ⁿ Crit. Sacr. p. 2. Cap. 1.

^o In Introduct. Nostra ad lib. Bibl. p. iii. Cap. 6. S. 8.

den, they degraded it into the Order of the *כחובים Catubem*, I cannot allow myself to believe. For if the Age of the *Jewish* Partition, of the Bible, were before *Christ*, as it is very likely to have been, according to what we have mentioned above, then the Book of *Daniel* might at that time have been excluded from the Body of the prophetic Books; not because of his clear Prophecies about the *Messiah*, and the Prejudice against him arising from thence, but because, though he was equal to other Prophets in point of Inspiration and Illumination, yet in respect of his publick Station, and his Manner of Life, he was not so strictly a Prophet, just as it happen'd in the Case also of *Job*, *David*, and *Solomon*. Neither is it any Objection to this, that *Christ* gives him the Title of a Prophet, *Matth.* xxiv. 15. which is to be understood of what he was in reality, not of his Rank in the sacred Books, or of the Place which *Daniel's* Prophecy ought to have there. But suppose that *Daniel* took Place among the prophetick Books at that time, and afterwards was at length transferr'd to the *Hagiographers*, yet by what Testimony, and upon what Assurance or Authority, will Mr. *Whiston* prove, that he was thus transferr'd about the Beginning of the second Century? Truly, excepting his *Hypothesis* about that Age, which was so fatal to the Perfection of the *Hebrew* Copy, he cannot find the least Colour for this Conceit. But since we have so often refuted that Supposition, there is no Reason to pay any Deference to it now.

But what our Adversary pleads in his *tenth* Observation, that the *Jews* intended, either quite to abolish and destroy the Book of *Daniel*, or however, to expunge and throw it out of the

Catalogue of the sacred Books, this is so far from engaging our Belief, that we have rather most evident Testimonies at Hand, which confirm the singular Veneration and Respect, which the *Jews* ever had for the Prophet *Daniel*. For besides the Proofs ⁹ we have elsewhere given in full Measure to this Purpose, the ^r *Gemarists*, upon Occasion of the Words of *Dan. x. 7.* prefer *Daniel* before the Prophets *Haggai*, *Zechariah*, and *Malachi*, his Contemporaries, אִדּוֹ עָרִיפוּ מִיְיָדוֹ רֵאיוֹנוֹ חֹזֵק וְאִמְרוֹ לֵאמֹר He was better than they, because he saw a prophetic Vision, which they did not see: * *Raymundus Martini* observes justly and truly, " The Book " of *Daniel* amongst the twenty four Books of " the holy Scripture, obtains one Degree by it- " self [*makes a distinct Book by itself*] because a- " mong them (the *Jews*) it is, and always hath " been esteemed, as true as true can be, only " taking out the History of *Bel*, *Susannah*, and " the *Dragon*, which according to the *Jews*, be- " long not to the Book of *Daniel*. Neither have " we found any Man so void of Sense among the " *Jews*, (excepting one lew'd *Sadducee*, by Name " *Porphyrius*) who ever presum'd to derogate ei- " ther from the Holiness or Veracity of *Daniel*." Whence it appears, that Mr. *Whiston* could not confirm his Fiction by any Voucher, neither could he recommend it, upon any other Colour of Pretence, but that of his own Suspicion only, that is to say, of the Pleasure he takes in slandering.

11. Our Disputant falls foul upon his own *Hypothesis*, when *eleventhly*, he appeals to *Origen's* Copy of the *Septuagint* Version, which he took into his *Hexapla*. For it is most false, that *Origen* re-

⁹ *Introduct. cit. loc. p. 236.*

3. col 1. sub. fin.
p. 270.

^r In *Cod. Megilla. fol.*

* *Pugion. fidei P. ii. Cap. iii. S. 3.*

ceiv'd that Copy from his *Jewish* Master, as accommodated to the corrupt *Hebrew* Copy. Let Mr. *Whiston* prove this Conceit, if he is able: We have found the Fact quite otherwise. For there was a Library kept in the Temple of *Serapis*, at first *Ptolemy's*, and That being burnt in the Time of the *Alexandrian* War, (carried on there by *Julius Cæsar* the Dictator, 48 Years before the Birth of *Christ*) then as *Epiphanius* testifies, ὕστερον καὶ ἐτέρα ἐχθροῦ βιβλιοθήκη ἐν τῷ Σεραπίῳ, μικροτέρα τῇ πρώτῃ, ἥτις καὶ θυγάτηρ ὠνομάσθη αὐτῆς, *There was afterwards another Library set up in the Temple of Serapis, much less than the former, which was therefore called its Daughter,* at the Expence and Direction of Queen *Cleopatra*. For an additional Ornament thereto, *Herod* then King of the *Jews*, sent the holy Books of the Old Testament, written in the *Hebrew* Language, together with the *Septuagint* Greek Translation of the same, which was then in use among the *Hellenists* in *Syria* and *Palestine*, and (as it seems) had been revised, and corrected in many Places, by some who were expert in the *Hebrew* Language. *Epiphanius* also gives Account, that the other *Greek* Versions of *Aquila*, *Symmachus*, and *Theodotion*, were some time after repositied there. And that Library was still remaining in the Age of *Tertullian*, yea of *Chrysostom* also. This the ^u former of them testifies; *At this Day, they [the Greek Copies] of Ptolemy's Library, in Serapis's Temple, are to be seen, together with the Hebrew: The* ^x *latter, in his Oration against Judaizing Christians, and those who celebrate Fasts with them, there speaking of that Library, he says: καὶ μέχρι νῦν ἐκεῖ τῇ Προφητῶν αἱ ἐφ-*

^u Lib. de Mensur. & Ponderib. Cap. xi. sub. fin. ^u Apologetici Cap. 18. ^x To. 6. Edit. Græc. Savillanæ. p. 373.

αὐτὴν διαθεῖσθαι βίβλοι μόνον, *And there the Version of Books of the Prophets is preserved to this time*: Even till the Temple of *Serapis*, in the Year of *Christ* 389, with other idolatrous Temples of *Egypt*, was demolished by command of *Theodosius*, and therewith the Books also destroy'd, as we understand from ^y *Ruffinus*, ^z *Marcellinus Comes*, and ^a *Orosius*. So then this Library being open to *Origen*, who was catechetical Teacher in the School of *Alexandria*, furnish'd him with that ancient, correct and accurate Copy of the *Septuagint* Version which was deposited in it; which differ'd very much from the *Vulgar* one, (then chiefly in use in the Churches, and going by the Name of the *Alexandrian* Version) and approach'd much nearer to the *Hebrew* Original, than the *Vulgar* did. This having been long before the second Century, repositd in the Temple of *Serapis*, and not subjected to the sacrilegious Will and Pleasure of the *Jews*, (whom *Mr. Whiston* dreams to have corrupted the *Greek* Bibles, and to have made them conformable to the corrupted *Hebrew* Copies) was faithfully written out, and put into his *Hexapla* by *Origen*, as the genuine Edition of the Translation of the *LXX* Interpreters. And this we confirm by the Authority and Approbation of ^b *Jerom*, who thus descants upon the Excellency of the *Hexaplar Septuagint* Version: " This I briefly hint to let you know, " that the Edition which *Origen* and *Eusebius* of *Cæsarea*, and all the *Greek* Commentators call κοινὴ, i. e. the *Vulgar*, and which is " by many Men called Λευκανὸς *Lucian's*, is different from the Edition of the *LXX* Interpreters, which is inserted in the *Hexa-*

^y *Histor. L. 2. Cap. 22. &c.*

^z *In Chronico.*

^a *Lib. 6. Cap. 15.*

^b *In Epist. 135. ad Suniam & Fretelam, de Psalterio, To. 4. opp. fol. 34. D.*

“ *plar* Copies, and has been faithfully translated
 “ into *Latin* by us, and is read in the publick Ser-
 “ vice at *Jerusalem*, and likewise in the *Oriental*
 “ Churches.” And a little below: “ But the
 “ *ῥωνη*, that is to say the *Vulgar* Edition, is the
 “ same with the *Septuagint*: Only there is this Dif-
 “ ference betwixt the two; that the Edition of
 “ the *Vulgar* is corrupted, according to Places,
 “ and Times, and according to the Pleasure of
 “ ancient Writers; but that which is kept in
 “ the *Hexapla*, and which we have translated, is
 “ the very Translation of the *LXX* Interpreters,
 “ which is preserv’d intire and uncorrupted in
 “ the Books of the learned. Whatever then dif-
 “ fers from this, no one needs doubt but that
 “ it likewise differs from the Authority of the
 “ *Hebrew* Copies.” Again, as to what the Ob-
 jector here rashly asserts, without any Authority,
 or ancient Testimony, that That Copy of *Ori-*
gen, was adapted to the *Hebrew* Text, as before
 corrupted by the *Jews*; That not only relies upon
 a bare Supposition, which he has taken up at
 Pleasure, and of which he has yet given us no
 Proof, about the Corruption of the *Hebrew* Co-
 pies, but it is farther so plainly false, that the
 whole Contrivance and Composition of that Work
 of *Origen*’s refutes it. For to what Purpose are
 the *Asterisks* put down by *Adamantius*, but to
 Note what was wanting in the *Greek* Copy,
 and what had been lately inserted into it, mostly
 from the Version of *Theodotion*, upon the Faith
 of the *Hebrew* Copies? Wherefore were the *Obe-*
lisks but to shew what was redundant in the
Greek, and not read in the *Hebrew*? For what
 Reason were the *Lemnisks*, but to mark out to us
 where a Word had been changed, or admitted
 of a different reading, or was to be corrected
 by a better Translation? So much did *Origen*’s
Septu-

Septuagint Version depart from the *Hebrew* Text, that it wanted to have Deficiencies supplied, and Redundancies pared off, and the ill-rendered or corrupt Places amended, together with great Variety of critical Helps, to bring it back again somewhat nearer to the *Hebrew* Text; so far is it from being true, that it was equally corrupted with that supposed corrupt *Hebrew* Copy, and that it was adjusted to it.

12. Moreover *twelfthly*, Whatsoever was done with some of the *Apocryphal* Books, which we readily grant, have received more Corruptions than one, either through the Ignorance or Negligence of Editors, yet there is no just Reason for charging in like Manner the canonical Books of the sacred Code. For they were treated with greater Reverence and Care by Men, and were more particularly privileged by divine Providence, that they should not be corrupted; as we have proved in our first Part. But what Consequence is this, to infer: The *Apocryphal* Books have been corrupted, therefore, the canonical Scriptures have undergone the same Fate? Though, if that were our present Business, we might easily demonstrate, that the little Histories of *Judith*, *Susannah*, *Bel and the Dragon*, were not designedly or fraudulently corrupted by the *Jews*, since it more suited their Interest and Inclination, to preserve those Writings whole and uncorrupted which advance the Glory of their Nation, and which adorn and strengthen it, either by Miracles, or by brave and shining Exploits. But to keep close to our Purpose, we observe that we have before confuted Mr. *Whiston's fifth Proposition*, about the *Jews* having changed their primitive original Character for a later one, which is the *Assyrian*;

13. His *thirteenth* Argument therefore taken from that Topick falls of itself. Though this is also a
very

very false Conclusion; that because the *Jews* adopted another Character, they therefore did it with Design to abolish the old *Hebrew* Copies, and to substitute corrupted Copies in their Room. For without doubt, before those pious and learned *Jews*, who were innocent of that wicked Design, would use this new Character, and lay aside the old one, they must have carefully compar'd both Copies, now of different Characters, together, examining the new ones by their old ones; because there might be some Umbrage for a Suspicion that the rejecting of the old Character, might have some latent Mischief lodged in it.

14. Likewise, his *fourteenth* Reason carries no Consequence with it: For it is false, that the Books of the New Testament so very exactly represented the Readings of the Old, since our Adversary himself hath observed several Differences in the Quotations, when he thought fit to accommodate them to his own Purpose; and we have also granted that it is so, and have shewn the way how those Difficulties may be reconcil'd and adjusted. As to *Philo* and *Josephus*, Mr. *Whiston* will persuade no body, except it be such as are utter Strangers to the Works of those two Writers, and know nothing of such Affairs, that they every where agree with the *Hebrew* Text of the Old Testament. Finally, our Adversary must have laid aside all Modesty, who after he had a little before with great Confidence and Pomp of Words, urged very weighty chronological Difficulties against the Perfection of the *Hebrew* Text, sometimes taken out of *Josephus*, and at other times from the New Testament, now at length contradicting himself, or altogether forgetful of himself, pleads, that no Signs of those chronological Difficulties are to be found there, but that they appeared first in the Beginning of the

the second Century. And from whence shall this Caviller prove that remarkable Consent of the Writers of the first Century with the *Hebrew* Copy, when he himself is fully persuaded, as he desires his Reader also to be, that none of the Records of that Age, whether Biblical and Canonical, or Ecclesiastical, or Profane, (such as are those of *Josephus*) escap'd the fraudulent and impure Hands of those Corrupters? Not to mention, that excepting the Books of the New Testament, there are at this Day but few Writings of the first Century remaining, which are of unquestionable Authority, and as undoubtedly belonging to the Authors whose Names they bear, that they should be admitted as competent Witnesses in this Case. So that all those trifling Pretences resolve at length into our Adversary's Imagination, big with incoherent, ill-concerted Fictions: But in Matters of Fact, and I add, of such high Importance too, we must have demonstrative Arguments, or credible Witnesses, and such as are beyond all Exception.

iii. Now as to those Things also which he advances about the Manner, how this *Jewish* Corruption passed into the *Greek* Copies of the *Christians*, they hang so oddly together, that their own Weakness betrays them. For may we not much more reasonably suppose, that the *Christians*, as soon as they should discover the great Disagreement of their own very ancient Copies, confirmed by the Consent of the New Testament, from the lately forged *Jewish* Copies, would have found out the Fraud, and have charged the *Jews* with Sacrilege, urged and opposed their own ancient reading to their Corruptions, and made grievous outcries of the Forgery of the new Copies, rather than yield the Cause to the Enemy, and deprave their own Copies according to the Will and Desire

fire of their Adversaries? Now that those apostolical Men, full of spiritual and lively Zeal for the Purity of Doctrine, and the Glory of God, could never be so weak, to say no worse, both their own Writings still extant shew, and the ecclesiastical Historians abundantly testify. ^c We have also demonstrated above, that it was impracticable, to make any such universal Corruption; nor shall Mr. ^d *Whiston*, with his poor Pretences, ever persuade us to the contrary. For the Church of *Christ* in *Palestine*, *Syria*, and all the East over, had innumerable *Greek* and *Hebrew* Copies, ancient, of good Note, and uncorrupted, which might immediately convict the Falsifiers of the Forgery, lay their Fraud open, and expose them to the Scorn of the whole World. And the more frequent and vehement the Disputes were at that time betwixt the *Christians* and *Jews*, about Religion and the coming of the *Messiah*, so much the less Room is there for suspecting any Collusion of the lately converted *Christians*, whether they had been *Jews* or *Gentiles*. Yea further, such a thing could never have taken effect among the *Jews* themselves, since the *Babylonian* Academies and Masters, at that time flourishing in Peace and Plenty, and in the Heighth of Study and good Literature, would never have suffered a new, false, and adulterated reading to be obtruded upon them, and their own genuine and perfect Copies, which they were then in Possession of, as also their ancient and sacred Character, to be taken away from them, and extorted out of their Hands. And to this we may add, the Condition of the *Jews* of *Palestine*, who had scarcely recovered themselves from the late Destructions of the *Vespasians*, but were still subject to the

^c Crit. Sacr. Cap. 3. S. 18. *cap.* 5.

^d p. 266.

Will and Pleasure of the Conquerors, dispers'd, banish'd, and reduced to the utmost Misery; they had something else to do, than to be contriving Tricks and Fooleries, of Men wanting Employ, being more concerned to provide for their own Safety and Lives, and to look out for Shelters to relieve their Nakedness. Finally, there were most grievous Animosities and Emulations between the circumcised Brethren of both Denominations: And the Accounts thereof transmitted to us from their ancient Records, make no mention of any such Disagreement of Copies, as Mr. *Whiston* dreams of. For the various Readings of the Eastern and Western *Jews*, which we have formerly spoken of, are of a much later Date, and they do not meddle with the Sense of the Scripture, neither do they at all concern our present Dispute. That Conceit of *Pezron's* is so rash, absurd, and void of all Reason, that one might wonder what colour it could put on, to impose so grossly upon Mr. *Whiston*, and to draw him into it, if it had not been contrived to cast a Slur upon the Scripture; and as to every thing of that Kind, we have often observ'd, he rushes into it of Course, by a Sort of blind Impulse.

iv. Certainly our Author lays a slippery Foundation for his Hypothesis, when he builds it upon the 28 *Pieces of Verses*, or imperfect Clauses, since neither all the Copies, nor the *Masora* agree about them, as we have prov'd above by an Example, from *Gen. iv. 8.* he might as justly draw a contemptible Argument of like kind, from any other *Masorethick* Observation, which has but obtain'd in most of the Copies, if the thing could be dispatched at once by such slender Artillery.

v. Neither lastly, can this Calumny, about the malicious Corruption of Copies, agree to *Rabbi Akiba* and his Companions. But indeed, if the Fact itself could be made appear, and if the Corruption of the Copies suppos'd to have been contrived in that Age, had been sufficiently prov'd and demonstrated, I must then own, that we can scarce pitch upon a Man among the *Rabbies*, that might better support Mr. *Whiston's* Suspicion, borrow'd from *Pezron*, than *Rabbi Akiba*. That he indeed was a Man of great Authority among his own People; that he was a Doctor of the Law for the Space of forty Years; that he countenanced *Barcochab*, the false *Messiah*, with his Approbation; and that he left no Stone unturn'd to persuade his Nation, that he was the true *Messiah*; all this has been abundantly shewn, not only by the Compilers of Rabbinical Libraries, but by *Bartoloccius*, and the very famous *Wolsius*, ^f *Wagenseilius*, & *Petit*, ^h *Gagneir*, ⁱ *Jac. Basnage*, and ^k *Pet. Bale*, from the *Talmud*, and other *Jewish* Records. But that he attempted so great a Villany, as to corrupt all the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Copies, and to accommodate them to his false *Messiah*, is what cannot be proved by the Testimony of any single Writer of the Ancients, but it is contrary to plain Fact. For *First*, The Prophecies about the *Messiah*, which it most of all concern'd the *Jews* to corrupt, remain still entire. *Secondly*, As the Copies of the first Century read the Texts, so likewise do those of the second and succeeding Ages read them. *Thirdly*, The *Greek* Translation of the *LXX* Elders, and the *Hebrew* Copy, differ very widely, neither is the one adjusted to

^f In *Sota*, p. 982. ^g Observation. Lib. iii. cap. 3. p. 302, &c.

^h In *Dedicacione Historiæ Josephi præ-*

missa.

ⁱ *Hist. Jud.* Lib. vi. cap. 9. S. 13. p. 1123.

&c.

^k In *Diction.* suo loco.

the other. *Fourthly*, Both the *Chaldee* Versions before the second Century, as also the *Samaritan* Code, confirm the *Hebrew* Readings in those Places, where it is charged with Corruption. Neither *Fifthly*, as we have remarked a little higher up, was it possible for *Akiba* to get together all the Copies, to abolish the perfect ones, to substitute corrupted ones in their Room, and to obtrude his own Readings upon the *Christian* Churches.

C H A P. X.

*An Examination of those Places which
Mr. Whiston recommends as proper
to be made use of, in order to
restore the true original Text of the
Old Testament.*

i. **O**UR Author having finished the Impeachment, and at length ¹ drawing towards a Conclusion of his Work, he proposes means and helps, which he deduces in the way of corollary from the Premises, by the Use of which, the true original Text of the Old Testament may be restored entire. And these are they.

1. " The *Samaritan Pentateuch* having been
" prov'd to be a pure and uncorrupt Copy of
" the five Books of *Moses*, ought to be admitted
" as such, and to be recommended to all *Chri-*
" *stian* People, by exactly following it in all our
" Versions, Quotations, and Commentaries: with

¹ p. 329, &c.

" only

“ only the various Lections of the present *Hebrew*
 “ and *Greek* in the Margin.

2. “ The *Greek* Psalms, as attested to by the
 “ *Roman* Psalter, having been prov’d a pure and
 “ uncorrupt Copy of the Book of *Psalms*, ought
 “ also to be admitted as such, and to be recom-
 “ mended to all *Christian* People, by following
 “ it in all our Versions, Quotations, and Com-
 “ mentaries; with only the various Lections of
 “ the present *Hebrew* and *Greek* in the Margin.

3. “ The Antiquities of *Josephus* the *Jew*,
 “ drawn from the most authentick *Hebrew* Co-
 “ pies of the *Jews* in the first Century, and
 “ reaching to a great Part of the Old Testament,
 “ especially to the historical Books, and the Pro-
 “ phesy of *Daniel*; will be a Sort of a Standard
 “ to compare all our later Copies by. Accord-
 “ ingly, we ought by his and other ancient Au-
 “ thority, to restore the first genuine Book of
 “ *Apocryphal Esdras*, and the *Septuagint Esther*,
 “ into the Places of our imperfect *Ezra* and *Est-
 “ her*; which are now by mistake accounted ca-
 “ nonical: And to put our *Ezra* and *Esther* a-
 “ mong the *Apocrypha* in their stead.

4. “ The present *Hebrew* Text will also be of
 “ great Use for restoring the original Reading,
 “ in the several Books of the Old Testament.
 “ For though it has been frequently abridg’d,
 “ disorder’d, and altered, in particular Places,
 “ especially where the Interest and Inclination of
 “ the unbelieving *Jews*, about the Beginning of
 “ the second Century, led them to it, yet are those
 “ abridg’d, disorder’d, and alter’d, but very few
 “ in Comparison of those that are right.

5. “ The several *Greek* Editions and Manu-
 “ scripts of the *Septuagint* Version now extant,
 “ with other Translations made anciently from
 “ it, will also be great Helps to the same Pur-
 “ pose.

“ pose. For the Version at first agreeing with
 “ the original *Hebrew*, and the ancientest Wri-
 “ ters of Christianity having always used it; these
 “ noble Remains of this Version, must generally
 “ speaking, especially when it agrees with the
 “ *Hebrew*, be good Evidence of the true Read-
 “ ing.

6. “ The old *Syriack* Version made, as ap-
 “ pears, from the *Hebrew* Original, before all
 “ those Copies were quite so corrupt as they
 “ now are; nay, as ^m *Du Pin* observes, is in
 “ some Places more conformable to the *Samari-
 “ tan Pentateuch*, and the *Septuagint* Version, than
 “ to our present *Hebrew*; will be a considerable
 “ Assistance to the same Purpose.

7. “ The *Chaldee* Paraphrases, especially the
 “ old ones of *Onkelos* upon the Law, and *Jona-
 “ than* upon the Prophets; which though made
 “ in general according to the later corrupt Co-
 “ pies; yet having had an *Hebrew* Text, not al-
 “ ways so bad as the present, will be some Assi-
 “ stance to us in the same Design. And the like
 “ may be said of the few Remains we have of the
 “ later *Greek* Versions; particularly, those of
 “ *Aquila*, *Symmachus*, and *Theodotion*, anciently
 “ preserved in the *Hexapla* of *Origen*.

8. “ The Works of *Philo*, the learned Jew
 “ of *Alexandria*, contemporary with *Christ* and
 “ his Apostles, will also be of good Use in re-
 “ storing the original Reading of the *Septuagint*,
 “ especially in the five Books of *Moses*. Pity it
 “ is, that he did not quote more Texts out of
 “ the other Books of the Old Testament; that so
 “ we might have restor’d more of the Readings
 “ of the *Septuagint* there from him.

9. “ All the Citations from the *Greek* Ver-

“ sion, made in the New Testament, in the *A-*
 “ *postolical Constitutions*, in all the most primitive
 “ Fathers, and even by any of the old Hereticks
 “ themselves, before, or not long after the Days
 “ of *Origen*; especially when carefully compar’d
 “ with the best Copies of the *Greek*, will be of
 “ very great Use to us; and indeed will enable us
 “ to restore no small Part of the most valuable
 “ and important Texts in the Old Testament, to
 “ their primitive Integrity.

10. “ Whatever Parts of the old *Italick* or *vul-*
 “ *gate Version* can be recovered, which are not a
 “ few, nor small already, and likely to be ma-
 “ ny more, and much larger upon farther En-
 “ quiry; will give us, in a Manner, that very
 “ *Septuagint Version*, whence it was most exactly
 “ made; and so will be of great Use for resto-
 “ ring the same Version. And since the present
 “ vulgar *Latin*, where it differs from *Jerom*, and
 “ the present *Hebrew*, contains generally the same
 “ *Italick*, or old *vulgate Version*, and is Part
 “ thereof as to the *Psalms*; that *Latin Copy* will
 “ be of some Use to the same Purpose.

11. “ Great search should be made in all Parts
 “ of the World for *Hebrew Copies*, that have
 “ never come into the Hands of the *Masorets*;
 “ and for *Greek Copies* of the *κοινὴ*, the vulgar
 “ *Septuagint Version*, read in the Churches all
 “ the first Ages of Christianity, or any Parts of
 “ them: For if any Books of these Kinds can be
 “ recovered, they will probably so far be un-
 “ corrupt Copies of the Old Testament.

ii. And thus the Conclusion of the Work, no
 foundier than the Treatise itself; partly rests upon
 the common Absurdity of *Cappellus*, *Jo. Morin-*
us, and other Anti-scripturists, as if Rivulets
 were purer than their Fountain, and the Copies
 of the Versions were transmitted down to Poste-

rity, more correct than the Copies of the original Text; and partly advances nothing new, but what has been brought upon the Stage before, and refuted by us. And therefore we think it a sufficient Answer, if we barely refer to what we have already replied to every particular Conceit of Mr. *Whiston*. For neither *First*, is the *Samaritan Pentateuch* free from Errors, nor is it more perfect than the *Hebrew* Copy, but it abounds with innumerable Faults, which we have shewn in a proper Place, some of which are of such a Kind, that even its very Advocates neither have Courage to defend them, nor Power to conceal them: Nor *Secondly*, Is the *Greek* Psalter of such known Integrity, as to deserve the Preference above the *Hebrew*. Nor *Thirdly*, Is the Credit of *Josephus* to be so much relied upon; for that in citing Texts, in explaining circumstantial Points of History, inventing Speeches out of his own Head, and especially in fixing the Epochs of Times, it is exceeding lame, and very frequently falters: In his *Fourth* Consideration, our *Restorer* falls foul upon his own *Hypothesis*. In order to restore the *Hebrew* Reading, he refers us to the *Hebrew* Copy, as to a great Help, and then again tells us, that the vitiated or corrupted Places are but very few, in Comparison of the other perfect and entire ones: And yet upon other Occasions, he hath often pleaded, that Corruption prevails throughout the whole Copy. In his *Fifth* Consideration, he entangles himself with very grievous Difficulties and Perplexities, referring us to different Editions of the *Greek* Version; which read so variously, intricately, and confusedly, that it is not in the Power of any Man to determine which is preferable, and much less, which of them is the true original Reading. In his *Sixth* Article, he betrays his Prejudice against the Original,

recom-

recommending the *Syriack* Translation chiefly on this Account, because it frequently comes nearer to the *Samaritan Pentateuch*, and the *Greek* Version, than the *Hebrew* Copy. This is so far from being any Commendation of the *Syriack* Translation, that it rather sets it below the *Greek* Version. In his *Seventh* Consideration, he is in doubt about the *Chaldee Paraphrases*, neither can he tell us, what they have taken from the original and uncorrupted *Hebrew* Reading, or what Defilement they have contracted from the Corruptions he there complains of. How then can any Man by following them, correct with any Certainty the *Hebrew* Text, or shew how it was read at first? As to his *Eighth*, he himself expects but little from it, where he confesses, that *Philo* can only afford us some Light in correcting the *Greek* Copy, but as to the *Hebrew* (which it is justly doubted, whether or no *Philo* ever read) he grants that he can do him no Service. In the *Ninth* Consideration, he again plunges himself into infinite Toils, when he undertakes to restore the Text from Quotations; and pretends that the genuine Reading of the Word of God, is kept more pure, even in the Writings of Hereticks, Enemies to the Truth, than in the sacred Copy. In his *Tenth* Article, he hath not shewn us what are the true and genuine Fragments of the *Italick* Version: But even they who esteem it *Authentick*, will scarce allow that the *Vulgate* is to correct the Original. In his *Eleventh* Article, he calls for such help as is no where to be found, since no *Hebrew* Copies prior to, or more ancient than the *Hebrew Masorethick* Copies, have been transmitted to our present Age, so far as appears; nor of the *Vulgar Greek* Version, which even then, when every Man had it for their common Use,

had many various Lections, and Men had different Sentiments of its Authority and Use.

To conclude, In every thing he betrays a Mind disaffected to divine Truth, and intent only upon this, how to make the holy Scripture doubtful, uncertain, and defective; that he may bring those Corruptions upon it, which he falsely pretends it already has, and may deprive it of all Authority and Credit: So that it behoves him to convert to his own Benefit, and to a seasonable Apprehension of his own Misery, that saying of our Saviour, with which, by an unlucky Omen, he concludes and shuts up his Book:

ὃν τὸ τῆς μὴ ἔχοντος, καὶ ὃ ἔχει, ἀρθήσεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ. *From him which hath not, shall be taken away, even that which he seemeth to have.*

F I N I S.

THE TABLE OF CONTENTS.

THE Translator's Preface.

The Author's Preface.

The Introduction.

CHAP. I.

Of the uncorrupted Reading of the Hebrew Bible, being one and the same, as well in the Primitive, as in the Modern Copies :

In which is examined Mr. *Whiston's* 1st PROP.

The Text of the Old Testament, generally speaking, in the History, Laws, Prophecies, and Psalms, is the same now that it ever has been from the utmost Antiquity, Pag. 3

PROP. III.

Our Hebrew Copies of the Old Testament, in very many Places, differ from the

Hebrew and Greek Copies, which were extant in the Time of Christ and his Apostles, Pag. 4

A Refutation of Mr. *Whiston's* Proofs,

I. From the Sacred Chronology, corrupted among the *Hebrews*, 4

II. From the Errors, both of Names and Numbers admitted in the *Hebrew* Copy by Librarians, 8

Where these Texts are vindicated,

Josh. xv. 60. Josh. xxi. 36, 37. 2 Chron. xii. 13. 1 King. xii. 8, 10. 2 Chron. xiii. 7. 1 King. xv. 1.

III. From the Difference of the *Hebrew* Text from the *Samaritan*, 18

IV. From the Difference between the *Greek* Text and the modern *Hebrew*,

21

V. From

TABLE of CONTENTS.

<p>V. From the Book of <i>Esdra</i>s, in the Greek and <i>Vulgar Latin Version</i>, being fuller than in the <i>Hebrew</i>, Pag. 24</p> <p>VI. From the Book of <i>Ester</i>, which is imperfect in the <i>Hebrew</i>, 30</p> <p>VII. From the Appendix to the Book of <i>Job</i>, which is wanting in the <i>Hebrew</i>, 35</p> <p>VIII. From <i>Dan.</i> x. 20. where there is a Blank in the <i>Hebrew</i>, 38</p> <p>IX. From the Prophecy of <i>Jonah</i>, mention'd 2 <i>King.</i> xiv. 25. which is wanting at this Day, 41</p> <p>X. From <i>Gen.</i> ii. 2. which is corrupted, 43</p> <p>XI. From <i>Gen.</i> iv. 8. where there is a Blank, 47</p> <p>XII. From <i>Gen.</i> xvii. 14. 54</p> <p>XIII. From <i>Exod.</i> xii. 40. 56</p> <p>XIV. From <i>Numb.</i> iv. 14. 58</p> <p>XV. From <i>Numb.</i> x. 6, &c. 59</p> <p>XVI. From <i>Numb.</i> xvi. 31, &c. 61</p> <p>XVII. From <i>Deut.</i> x. 6. compar'd with <i>Numb.</i> xx. 22---29. 66</p> <p>XVIII. From <i>Deut.</i> xxxii. 8. 67</p> <p>XIX. From <i>Deut.</i> xxxiii. 6. 71</p> <p>XX. From the Order of the four last Chapters of the Book of <i>Judges</i>, 75</p>	<p>XXI. From <i>Judg.</i> xviii. 1. 77</p> <p>XXII. From 1 <i>Sam.</i> xvii. 4. 80</p> <p>XXIII. From 2 <i>Sam.</i> xv. 7. 81</p> <p>XXIV. From 1 <i>King.</i> xiii. 82</p> <p>XXV. From 1 <i>King.</i> xiii. compar'd with <i>Josephus</i>, 84</p> <p>XXVI. From 1 <i>King.</i> xv. 2. 86</p> <p>XXVII. From <i>Amos</i> i. 1. 88</p> <p>XXVIII. From <i>Psal.</i> xxii. 17. about כּאֶרֶץ <i>Caare</i>, 90</p> <p>XXIX. From <i>Psal.</i> cxlv. 13. 93</p> <p>XXX. From many Books of <i>Jeremiah</i>, <i>Ezekiel</i>, and <i>Daniel</i>, which have been lost, 96</p> <p>XXXI. From <i>Ezek.</i> i. 1, 2, 3. 100</p> <p>XXXII. From <i>Ezek.</i> xlii. 16---20. 101</p>
---	--

C H A P. II.

Of the Citations out of the Old Testament made in the New, 104

P R O P. XIII.

The Texts cited by our Saviour, his Apostles, and the rest of the Writers of the New Testament, out of the Old, were truly cited by them; and in Agreement with the genuine Hebrew

TABLE of CONTENTS.

Hebrew and Greek Bibles of that Age,	105	VIII. <i>Acts</i> vii. 43. compar'd with <i>Amos</i> v. 27.	132
A previous Inquiry about the Quotations of the New Testament from the Old, containing Observations,	Pag. 106	IX. <i>Gal.</i> iii. 10. compar'd with <i>Deut.</i> xxvii. 26.	134
I. Of the Difference of Citations,	106	X. <i>Eph.</i> iv. 8. compar'd with <i>Psal.</i> lxxviii. 19.	136
II. Of the Fountain and Place of the Texts cited,	107	Texts supposed to be wanting in the Hebrew.	
III. Of the Words which are cited,	110	I. <i>Matth.</i> i. 5.	138
IV. Of the Sense, Drift, and Design of a Citation,	119	II. <i>Matth.</i> ii. 23.	139
V. Of the Form of quoting,	121	III. <i>Matth.</i> xiii. 35.	139
VI. Of the Likeness and Affinity of Citations,	122	IV. <i>Matth.</i> xxiii. 35.	140
The Places misinterpreted by Mr. Whiston are vindicated.		V. <i>Mark</i> ix. 13.	140
I. <i>Matth.</i> ii. 15. compar'd with <i>Hosea</i> xi. 1.	124	VI. <i>Luke</i> xi. 49.	141
II. <i>Matth.</i> xix. 5, 6. <i>Mark</i> x. 7, 8. compar'd with <i>Gen.</i> ii. 24.	126	VII. <i>John</i> vii. 38.	143
III. <i>Matth.</i> xxvii. 9, 10. where <i>Jeremiah</i> is cited in place of <i>Zechariah</i> ,	127	VIII. and IX. <i>Acts</i> vii. 23--30.	144
IV. <i>Luke</i> iv. 16--19. compar'd with <i>Isa.</i> lxi. 12.	128	X. <i>Rom.</i> iii. 13--18. compar'd with <i>Psal.</i> xiv.	144
V. <i>Luke</i> iv. 25. and <i>James</i> v. 17.	128	XI. <i>Eph.</i> v. 14.	145
VI. From the Title, by which our Saviour in the New Testament, is often styled <i>the Just</i> , compar'd with <i>Isa.</i> xli. 2.	129	XII. 1 <i>Tim.</i> v. 18.	145
VII. <i>John</i> viii. 5--7.	130	XIII. 2 <i>Tim.</i> iii. 8.	145
		XIV. <i>Heb.</i> xi. 37.	146
		XV. <i>Heb.</i> xii. 21.	148
		XVI. <i>James</i> iv. 5.	149
		XVII. 2 <i>Pet.</i> ii. 4. compar'd with <i>S. Jude</i> , ver. 6.	152
		XVIII. <i>St. Jude</i> , ver. 14, 15.	153
		XIX. From <i>Clem. Rom.</i> 1 <i>Ep.</i> to the <i>Cor.</i> §. 8. And <i>Clem. Alex.</i> <i>Pædag.</i> ch. 10. quoting a Prophecy of <i>Ezekiel</i> , which is wanting,	154
		XX. From other Citations of <i>Clemens Rom.</i> which are at present no where to be seen,	156, 157
		The Reasons by which Mr.	

TABLE of CONTENTS.

Mr. *Whiston* endeavours to prove his XIIIth PROPOSITION are refuted; where an *Observation* is premised, *That tho' the Citations in the New Testament were made with great Fidelity and Accuracy by Christ and his Apostles, yet from thence it doth not follow, that in ancient Times they were read precisely in the same Words in the Authentick Copies of the Old Testament, in which they are at present read in the New,*
Pag. 158

Mr. *Whiston's* Reasons are,

- I. Because very many Citations agree with the *Septuagint Greek Version*, as also with the *Hebrew Copy*: Therefore we must believe, that they always and in every Respect did so, *Answ.* 159
- II. Because the Citations of the Apostles had not convicted the *Jews*, unless they had been exactly conformable to the *Hebrew Copy*, *Answ.* 161
- III. Because *Philo* upon *Gen. ii. 24, &c.* shews the exact Agreement, *Answ.* 162
- IV. Because *Josephus* confirms the Citations of the New Testament, against

the reading of the Old, *Answ.* 163

V. Because the Adversaries of the Christian Religion would have charged the Citations of the New Testament as false, if they had not exactly agreed with the Text of the Old, *Answ.* 164

VI. Because the *Apostolical Fathers* shew, that the Citations of the New Testament from the Old, were made with the greatest Fidelity, *Answ.* 165

VII. Because in those Places, where the ancient Reading in the *Hebrew Copy* still remains, we always find it retain'd in the Citations which are made in the New Testament, *Answ.* 166

VIII. Because the *Apostolical* Citations, which vary from the Modern Reading of the Old Testament, do better answer to the Context and Coherence of the several Places, than the Reading of the Old Testament, *Answ.* 167

As for Example,

1. *Matth. i. 23.* compar'd with *Isa. vii. 14.* 167
2. *Matth. ii. 6.* compar'd with *Micah v. 2.* 169
3. *John*

TABLE of CONTENTS.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>3. <i>John</i> xix. 37. compar'd
with <i>Zech.</i> xii. 10. 171</p> <p>4. <i>Rom.</i> x. 18. compar'd
with <i>Psal.</i> xix. 5. <i>Pag.</i>
173</p> <p>5. <i>1 Cor.</i> xv. 54. com-
par'd with <i>Isa.</i> xxv. 8.
175</p> <p>6. <i>Heb.</i> viii. 8, &c. com-
par'd with <i>Jer.</i> xxxi. 32.
175</p> <p>7. <i>Heb.</i> x. 5. compar'd
with <i>Psal.</i> xl. 6. 177</p> <p>8. <i>Acts</i> xv. 16, 17. com-
par'd with <i>Amos</i> ix. 11,
12. 179</p> | <p>Genius of Translations,
<i>Answ.</i> 186</p> <p><i>Secondly</i>, From the Nature
of the Sacred Books,
<i>Answ.</i> 186</p> <p><i>Thirdly</i>, From the com-
mon Approbation given
to this Version, both by
the <i>Jews</i> and the Primi-
tive Christians, <i>Answ.</i>
187</p> <p><i>Fourthly</i>, From the Testi-
monies of <i>Aristeas</i>, <i>Philo</i>,
and <i>Josephus</i>, <i>Answ.</i> 188</p> <p><i>Fifthly</i>, Because the <i>Jews</i>
believed the Interpreters
to have been divinely In-
spir'd, <i>Answ.</i> 188</p> <p><i>Sixthly</i>, From <i>Christ</i> and
his Apostles quoting this
Version, <i>Answ.</i> 188</p> <p><i>Seventhly</i>, From the Silence
of the Enemies of the
<i>Christian Religion</i>, <i>Answ.</i>
189</p> <p><i>Eighthly</i>, From the Con-
viction and Conversion
of the <i>Jews</i> of that Age,
<i>Answ.</i> 189</p> |
|---|---|

CHAP. III.

*Of the State and Condition
of the Septuagint Greek
Translation, in Ancient and
Modern Copies.*

Mr. *Whiston's* II^d. PROP.
is this :

*The Greek Version of the
Old Testament, called the
Septuagint Version, as it
stood in the Days of Christ
and his Apostles, was a-
greeable to the genuine He-
brew Text, as it was in
that Age:* 183

Whose Reasons for it, af-
ter premising a general
Observation, are discuf-
sed, viz. 183

First, From the natural

PROP. IV. runs thus :

*The Modern Copies of the
Septuagint Version, since
the second Century, espe-
cially since the Days of
Origen, are also conside-
rably different from those
genuine Hebrew and Greek
Copies, which were extant
in the first Century, in the
Days of Christ and his
Apostles,*

TABLE of CONTENTS.

Apostles, which is answer'd very briefly, 190

PROP. VII.

The present Septuagint Version of the Psalms of David, especially as still preserved in its most ancient Latin Version the Roman Psalter, is a faithful and uncorrupt Copy of that sacred Book, as it stood both in the Hebrew and Greek Copies of the first Century, Pag. 191

In the Discussion of this Proposition, the *Italick* Version of the *Roman* Psalter is consider'd, 191

CHAP. IV.

Of the Divine Original of the Song of Songs, and its Canonical Authority, 195

Mr. *Whiston* had professedly impugn'd it, in an Appendix to his Treatise, publish'd by itself, in the following Year 1723. In this

PROPOSITION,

The Book of Canticles is not a sacred Book of the Old Testament, nor ever held for such, either by the Jewish or Christian Church, 196

For the clearing of which he asserts,

i. That *Solomon* compos'd the *Canticles* when immers'd in Pleasures, and wholly given to Idolatry, *Answ.* 197

Mr. *Whiston* pretends to prove his Opinion,

1. From *Cant.* i. 9. *Answ.* 200

2. From *Cant.* vi. 12. *Answ.* 201

3. From *Cant.* viii. 6. and vi. 8, 9. *Answ.* 204

ii. Moreover, this Book contains nothing which may contribute to the Practice of Virtue, to a saving Knowledge of God, to the instilling of Religion into our Minds, or lastly, which hath any Relation to the Mystery and Kingdom of the *Messiah*, *Answ.* 209

iii. This Book is not Mystical, because the Use of Allegories, or Mystical Meanings among the *Jews*, is of a much later Date than *Solomon*, *Answ.* 212

iv. No Writer of the Old Testament either cited the *Song of Solomon*, or made any Allusion to it, *Answ.* 215

v. The Apocryphal Writers of the Old Testament, neither

TABLE of CONTENTS.

- neither cited nor approved of the *Canticles*,
Answ. 216
- vi. *Philo* no where makes mention of the *Canticles*; whence it follows, that in his Age the *Hellenist Jews* had not this Book in their Copy, *Answ.* Pag. 217
- vii. That *Josephus*, as upon other Occasions, so particularly in his Catalogue of the divinely inspir'd Scriptural Books, hath been wholly silent about the *Canticles*, *Answ.* 219
- viii. That *Christ* himself never appeal'd, or alluded to the *Canticles*, *Answ.* 220
- ix. *St. John*, in the *Revelations*, where he speaks about the Marriage of the Lamb, yet made no mention of this Song, *Answ.* 221
- x. The four Evangelists, with *St. Peter*, *St. Paul*, *St. James*, *St. Jude*, *Clements* *Rom.* *Barnabas*, *Hermas*, and *Polycarh*, know nothing of the *Canticles*, *Answ.* 222
- xi. The *Canticles* were not known to, or however not mention'd by the Author of the first Book of the *Apostolical Constitutions*, *Answ.* 224
- xii. The like may be said of the second Book of the *Apostolical Constitutions*, ch. v. and vii. where the Publick Reading of the Scriptures is appointed, 225
- xiii. xiv. Finally, this is clear from the fifth Book, and the whole Body of the *Apostolical Constitutions*, *Answ.* 225
- Neither can its Authority be supported by any other Remains of Ecclesiastical Antiquity, *Answ.* 226

CHAP. V.

Of the genuine and primitive Character of the Hebrew Letters, 227

Mr. Whiston's Vth PROP.

That entire Change which has been made in the Characters of the Hebrew Bible, from the old Samaritan, to the new Chaldee, was not done by Ezra, as the modern Jews pretend; but by the Jews themselves, about the Beginning of the second Century of Christianity, 228

His Reasons are Answer'd, 232

CHAP.

TABLE of CONTENTS.

CHAP. VI.

About the Spuriousness of the Samaritan Pentateuch, 236

This is Mr. *Whiston's* Vith PROP.

The Samaritan Pentateuch, even as now among us, is generally a faithful and uncorrupt Copy of the five Books of Moses, as that Pentateuch was extant, both in Hebrew and Greek, in the Days of Christ and his Apostles, Pag. 236

Where every one of Mr. *Whiston's* Reasons are answer'd in Order, but chiefly it's enquir'd about חוה *Hu* instead of חיה *He*, in the *Heb. Gen.* 239

About the Name of *Benjamin* which Mr. *Whiston* pleads, ought to be read *Benjamim*, with the *Samaritan Copy*, 240

About *Deut. xxvii. 4.* where he labours to prove, that it is rightly read *Gerizim* in the *Samaritan*, for *Ebal*, as it is in the *Hebrew Copy*, 243

CHAP. VII.

Of the Citations of the Texts

of the Bible, in the Writings of the Fathers of the Ancient Church, 251

About which Mr. *Whiston's* VIIIth PROP. is this :

Philo the Jew, the sacred Authors of the New Testament, the Apostolical Fathers, with the primitive Greek and Latin Writers now extant, of almost four entire Centuries, do every one make their Citations out of the Old Testament, not from the Hebrew Original, but the Septuagint Version thereof; or from some Latin Translations made, according to that Septuagint Version; where

- i. Mr. *Whiston's* Arguments are produced in Order, 251
- ii. An Answer is given to every one of them, 255

CHAP. VIII.

Of Josephus, and his Scriptural Citations and Chronology.

PROP. IX.

Josephus the famous Jewish Historian, Contemporary with the Apostles of our Saviour, always made use of the Hebrew Copies of the

TABLE of CONTENTS.

the Old Testament, and not of the Septuagint Version in his Antiquities, Pag.
261

i. Mr. *Whiston's* Arguments set forth, 261

ii. The Testimonies of Learned Men, not favourable to the Credit of *Josephus*, are produc'd, 265

iii. That his Fidelity fails, and is to be suspected in his Antiquities, prov'd by Examples; from which it is manifest,

First, That if he was not ignorant of, yet he certainly neglected the *Hebrew* Text, 269

Secondly, That he perverts the Sense of *Moses*, 270

Thirdly, He adds many Things to the sacred Text, either from *Jewish* Traditions, or out of his own Imagination, or to display his Eloquence, 270

Fourthly, He passes over in Silence and conceals many Things which we read in Scripture, and which were material to be inserted, 272

Fifthly, He reports Things contrary and repugnant to Scripture, 273

Sixthly, He speaks disrespectfully of Divine Mi-

racles, and leaves the Reader to judge as he pleases about them, 273

iv. Mr. *Whiston's* Arguments are Answer'd,

First, From the *Circumstances* of the Writer, which requir'd that he should rather use the Original, than the *Greek* Text, 274

Secondly, From the comparing of *Josephus's* Antiquities with the Original *Hebrew*, 275

Thirdly, From comparing the ninth Book of the Antiquities of *Josephus*, c. 11. with *Nabum* ii. 9, &c. 276

Fourthly, From the Protections of *Josephus*, 277

v. What, and what Kind of Copy of the *Hebrew* Text may we think *Josephus* made use of? 277

PROP. X.

The genuine Chronology of Josephus agreed, neither with the present Hebrew, nor with the present Greek; but almost always with that of the Samaritan Pentateuch. Here,

i. The Nature and Weight of our Adversary's Proof is consider'd and declar'd, 278

A a ii. It

TABLE of CONTENTS.

ii. It is shewn what Judgment should be made of *Josephus's* Chronology, viz. Pag. 279

First, That *Josephus* differs no less from the *Samaritan* Calculation, than from the *Hebrew* and *Greek*, 280

Secondly, *Josephus* is not consistent with, but oftentimes contradicts himself, as appears by comparing his Numbers, 281
Thirdly, Some of those Contradictions must be attributed to *Josephus* himself, 281

Fourthly, Others to Librarians, by whose Negligence the Numbers are often faulty, 282

Fifthly, It is no ways evident what the Numbers of *Josephus* were at first, nor what Chronological Calculations he followed, 282

Sixthly, It is a profane thing, from the faulty Numbers of *Josephus*, to charge Corruption upon the *Hebrew* Chronology, 283

CHAP. IX.

Of the pretended Corruption designedly brought into the Hebrew and Greek Copies by the Jews, 284

PROP. XII.

The Jews, about the beginning of the second Century of the Gospel, greatly altered and corrupted their Hebrew and Greek Copies of the Old Testament; and that in many Places on purpose, out of Opposition to Christianity.

i. Mr. *Whiston's* Arguments and Conjectures are set down at full length, 284

ii. The same are confuted in order, viz.

1. That the *Jews* persuade Men to, and approve of corrupting the Scripture, in their *Talmud*, by Testimonies of their *Masters* quoted to that Purpose, *Answ.* 302

2. That the Obstinacy and Stubbornness of the *Jews* against our Saviour, his Worship and Religion, makes it probable, *Answ.* 308

3. The *Jews* were incited to it by the Disputes they had with the *Christians*, that they might not be compell'd to submit to them, *Answ.* 309

4. The *Hebrew* and *Greek* Texts admirably agreed together in the first Century, *Answ.* 311

5. That the Chronology in the *Pentateuch* was designedly

TABLE of CONTENTS.

signedly corrupted, that it might not be applicable to *Jesus of Nazareth*, but to the false *Messias Barcohab*, *Answ.* Pag. 311

Where the Tradition of *Elias*, about the six thousand Years of the World, is separately consider'd.

6. That Changes chiefly occur in those Places, which have Relation to the *Christian* Religion, or the *Jewish* Nation: where *Matth.* i. 22, &c. and *Isa.* vii. 17. are particularly treated of, *Answ.* 315

7. This at the same time is confirm'd by the Testimony of *Justin Martyr*, *Answ.* 320

- 8, 9. As also from the three *Greek* Versions of *Aquila*, *Theodotion*, and *Symmachus*, *Answ.* 320

- 10 That the *Chaldee* *Paraphrases* of *Onkelos*, and *Jonathan*, were forged and contrived upon the same Design, *Answ.* 320

Where mention is made of *Daniel's* Place in the *Hebrew* Copy, and its Exclusion from the Order of the Prophets, *Answ.* 321

11. That *Origen's* Copy of the *Septuagint Translation*, which he inserted into his

Hexapla, was equally corrupted with the rest, being given to him by his *Jewish* Master, *Answ.* 322

12. That the *Jews* corrupted some *Apocryphal* Books, whence we may conclude as much of the *Canonical*, *Answ.* 326

13. That the *Jews* for the same Purpose changed their old Character for a new one, *Answ.* 326

14. That before the second Century, those Contradictions and Deficiencies, were not found in the Books of the Old Testament, which from that Time and forward, we have been perplex'd with, *Answ.* 227

- iii. What Mr. *Whiston* has supposed about the Manner how this Corruption was undertaken and perform'd, consider'd and refuted, 328

- iv. Mr. *Whiston* endeavours to prove, from the 28 Pieces of Verses, or imperfect Clauses, that an universal Corruption was possible, *Refuted*, 330

- v. That the Authors of the Corruption were *Rabbi Akiba*, *Aquila*, *Onkelos*, and *Jonathan*, as Mr. *Whiston* asserts, *Refuted*, 331

TABLE of CONTENTS.

CHAP. X.

*An Examination of those
Helps which Mr. Whiston
recommends as proper to be
made use of, in order to
restore the true original
Text of the Old Testament.*

Which are,

- i. Produced and set down
in Order, according to
Mr. Whiston, Pag. 332
- ii. Exploded and refuted,
as they deserve, 333



ADDENDA

ADDENDA & EMENDANDA.

AUTHOR's Preface, Page 2, for *productive of Prodigies, some Years ago*, read *productive of Novelties, a few Years ago*.

Page 19, line 5, for *monstruous* read *monstrous*.

P. 19, 20, The Author here maintaining the Preference due to the *Hebrew* above the *Samaritan Text*, gives eight Instances wherein the *Hebrew* is preferable. But the Reader should be told, that *five* of those Instances, taken from uncorrect Copies of the *Samaritan Pentateuch*, are not applicable to the more correct Edition of it in *Walton's Polyglott*; for there the *Hebrew* and *Samaritan* agree in all those *five*; and *three* only remain in which they differ, and in which the *Hebrew* is preferable: which *three* are, the *third*, the *seventh*, and the *eighth*.

P. 21, l. 31, for *differs* r. *differ*.

P. 23, l. 29, for *let be it* r. *let it be*.

P. 39, l. 30, for *herewith* r. *herein*.

P. 50, & 74, for *Megalander Lutherus* r. *The great Luther*.

P. 50, l. ult. for *him* r. *them*.

P. 60, l. 31, for *ch. iv.* r. *ch. ii. 3*.

P. 61, l. 14, for *Levit. ii.* r. *Numb. ii.*

P. 71, l. 26, for *Numb. i. ii. iii.* r. *Numb. i. 23*.

P. 73, l. 1, for 8 r. viii.

P. 81, *Against the Faith of all Copies and Translations, contra omnium Codicum pariter ac versionum Fidem*. I suppose, our Author here means only *all the Hebrew and Greek Copies*, which is what Mr. *Whiston* himself owns p. 73. But the *Syriac* and *Arabic Versions* read not *forty*, but *Four* in this Place, as well as *Josephus* and *Theodore*t.

P. 91, l. 34, for *Deut. iv. 24.* r. *Deut. iv. 20*.

P. 92, l. 2, for *as in another Case*, r. *as elsewhere*.

P. 92, l. 27, for 1 Sam. r. 2 Sam.

P. 96, l. 2, for *εἰς* r. *εἰς*.

P. 109, l. 1, for *Psal. cxxxii.* r. *cxxxii*.

P. 110,

- P. 110, l. 18, for *Matth. v. 24.* r. *Matth. v. 21.*
P. 110, l. 20, for *Psal. cxviii. 12.* r. *Psal. cxviii. 22.*
P. 122, l. 24, for *Zech. iii. 15.* r. *Zech. iii. 8.*
P. 128, l. 5, for *ch. viii. ver. 17.* r. *ch. xi. ver. 12, 13.*
P. 128, l. 25, for *tempting* r. *attempting.*
P. 145, l. 18, for *Isa. lx. 12.* r. *Isa. lx. 1, 2.*
P. 180, l. ult. dele *Moses Marcus.*
P. 202, l. 22, for *Ruth iv. 9.* r. *Ruth iv. 19.*
P. 210, l. 5, for *escially* r. *especially.*
P. 214, l. 3, for *τοιαῦτοις* r. *τοιαύταις.*
P. 214, l. 6, for *ἐχλοῖς* r. *ἔχλοις.*
P. 221, l. 11, for *xxv. 15.* r. *xxv. 1.*
P. 280, l. 31, for *Exod. xii. 30.* r. *Exod. xii. 40.*
P. 281, l. 5, for *Numbers* r. *He numbers.*
P. 282, l. 20, for *Editors* r. *Librarians.*
P. 283, l. 1, for *approved of any* r. *agreed with any.*
P. 332, l. 11, for *Places* r. *Helps.*

BOOKS printed for BERNARD LINTOT.

FOLIO.

		<i>l.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
1	D R. Fiddes's Body of Divinity. 2 Vols.	2	10	0
2	Monf. <i>Bafneage's</i> History of the <i>Jews</i> .	1	5	0
3	The Works of the learned <i>Hooker</i> .	1	1	0
4	<i>Seldeni Opera omnia</i> , 6 Vols.	6	14	0
5	Capt. <i>Brevat's</i> Remarks on several Parts of <i>Europe</i> , with 47 Copper-plates.	2	10	0
6	<i>Wiquesfort's</i> Ambassador and his Functions.	1	5	0
7	Mr. <i>Vernon's</i> Chancery Cafes, 2 Vols.	2	5	0
8	Reports in the <i>Kings-Bench</i> , by <i>Robert Skinner</i> , Esq; publish'd by Mr. Serj. <i>Skinner</i> .	1	10	0
9	<i>Coke's</i> Com. on <i>Littleton</i> , the 11th Edit.	3	10	0
10	Dr. <i>Wood's</i> Institutes of the Laws of <i>Eng-</i> <i>land</i> , 4th Edit.	1	2	6
11	Maxims of Equity, by <i>Richard Francis</i> , Esq;	0	7	6
12	Mr. <i>Jeak's</i> Com. on the Charters of the Cinque Ports, with a large Index.	1	5	6
13	<i>Gowel's</i> Interpreter or Law Dictionary.	0	16	0
14	The Works of <i>Chaucer</i> , by Mr. <i>Urry</i> .	1	15	0
15	Mr. <i>Pope's</i> Miscellaneous Works.	0	12	0
16	----- His <i>Homer's</i> Iliad, 6 Vols.	12	s.	per Vol.
17	----- His <i>Homer's</i> Odyfsey, 5 Vols.	12	s.	per Vol.

QUARTO.

1	<i>Oratio in Martyrium Reg. Car. I. a Gul. Crowe</i> .	0	1	0
2	Mr. <i>James's</i> Theory and Pract. of Gardening.	0	17	6
3	Mr. <i>Cibber's</i> Plays, 2 Vols. Royal Pap.	1	5	0
4	Mr. <i>Gay's</i> Poems, in 2 Vols. Royal Pap.	1	5	0
5	<i>Joan Keill</i> , M. D. & R. S. S. <i>Oxon. Epist.</i> <i>Bernoulli</i> .	0	1	0
6	Mr. <i>Lamb's</i> Account of Charity-Schools.	0	0	3

OCTAVO.

BOOKS printed for BERNARD LINTOT.

OCTAVO.

l. s. d.

- | | | |
|----|--|---------|
| 1 | Mr. Gardiner's Exposition of our Saviour's Sermon in the Mount. | } 0 5 0 |
| 2 | Mr. Gardiner's two Remarkable Prophecies. | 0 0 6 |
| 3 | Dr. Bishop's Sermons on the Trinity. | 0 5 0 |
| 4 | ----- His Abridgement of Bishop Pearson on the Creed. | } 0 4 6 |
| 5 | Bp. Williams's 12 Sermons at Boyle's Lecture. | 0 5 0 |
| 6 | Mr. Canon Goddard's 6 Sermons. | 0 1 0 |
| 7 | Dr. Tilly's 16 Sermons at St. Mary's, Oxon. | 0 5 0 |
| 8 | Plato's Dialogues of the Immortality of the Soul. | } 0 1 0 |
| 9 | Cockburn concerning the intermediate State of blessed Souls. | } 0 1 0 |
| 10 | Seneca's Morals, by Sir Roger L'Estrange, 12th Edit. with Cuts. | } 0 5 0 |
| 11 | An Essay on the Extent of private Judgment in Religious Matters. | } 0 3 0 |
| 12 | Roman Catholick System of Allegiance. | 0 1 0 |
| 13 | The Lives of the Popes. | 0 5 0 |
| 14 | Sentences of Ali Son of Mahomet, by Mr. Ockley, Author of the Hist. of Saracens. | } 0 0 6 |
| 15 | The Doctrine, Discipline, and Worship of the Mahometans, by Leland. | } 0 4 0 |
| 16 | Dr. Gedde's Tracts against Popery. | 0 5 0 |
| 17 | Mr. Gretton's Review of the Argument a Priori against Dr. Clark. | } 0 1 6 |
| 18 | Mr. Chillingworth's Judgment of the Religion of Protestants. | } 0 0 4 |
| 19 | Sir Charles Scarborough's Account of the Plague. | } 0 1 0 |
| 20 | Baglive's Practice of Physick, by Dr. Turner. | 0 5 0 |
| 21 | Hepburn de Scriptis Pitcarnianis. | 0 0 6 |
| 22 | Dwight de Vomitione. | 0 1 6 |
| 23 | ----- De Hydropibus. | 0 1 0 |
| 24 | Kennedy of the Eye. | 0 2 0 |
| 25 | A Treatise of the Small Pox. | 0 1 0 |
| 26 | The Practical Distiller. | 0 1 0 |
| 27 | Smith's compleat Body of Distilling. | 0 2 6 |
| 28 | Howard's newest Way in all Sorts of Cookery. | 0 2 6 |
| 29 | An Essay on Money and Bullion. | 0 0 6 |

6
o
6
o
o
o
o
o
o
6
o
o
6
4
o
o
6
6
o
o
o
o
6
6
6